Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-051
Friday
15 March 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-051 *15 March 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: As of 13 March 1991, Moscow domestic radio sourcelines in the DAILY REPORT will reflect how a station identifies itself. This change eliminates the "Domestic Service" designation in favor of the station identification as broadcast. The presence of a new radio sourceline reflects this change in policy, rather than the establishment of a new station or network.

An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

CEMA RELATIONS

CEMA Meeting Held 14-15 March in Moscow 1
Agenda Discussed *[Prague TV]* 1
Successor Organization Disputed *[TASS]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Envoy Vorontsov on UN Potential, Iraq *[TASS]* 2
PRAVDA Meets 'Fraternal' Press Representatives *[13 Mar]* 2

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Baker Visits Moscow Following Mideast Tour 3
Arrives 14 Mar, Plans Noted *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 15 Mar]* 3
Bessmertnykh Describes First Talks *[TASS]* 3
Talks Continue 15 Mar *[TASS]* 4
Regional Issues Discussed *[TASS]* 4
Meets With Gorbachev 15 Mar *[TASS]* 5
Mideast States' Reaction to Baker Plan Assessed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Mar]* 5
Baker's Damascus Talks Emphasize UN Resolutions *[Moscow International]* 6
U.S. Policy Shift on ABM Treaty Questioned *[TASS]* 6
PRAVDA Reports Postwar U.S. Celebration *[13 Mar]* 7

China

Rogachev, Maslyukov Continue Beijing Visit 7
Maslyukov Continues Economic Talks *[Moscow International]* 7
Rogachev Meets Counterpart 15 Mar *[TASS]* 8
Consultations Held on Cambodia *[IZVESTIYA 15 Mar]* 8

Northeast Asia

Groundwork Laid for Gorbachev Visit to Japan 9
Gorbachev Greets Friendship Group *[TASS]* 9
Bessmertnykh Invited to Japan *[Moscow Radio]* 9
Japanese Premier Comments *[TASS]* 9
Gorbachev Seeks 'Breakthrough' *[Moscow International]* 9
'Favorable Environment' Questioned *[Moscow International]* 9
Economist Eyes Continuing Kuril Disputes With Japan *[TASS]* 10
Laverov Attends Technological Exhibition in Tokyo *[TASS]* 11

Near East & South Asia

Israeli Foreign Ministry Official Visits 11

Meets With Belonogov 14 Mar *[TASS]* 11
Speaks With Bessmertnykh *[TASS]* 11
Belonogov Arranges Israel Visit *[Tel Aviv MA'ARIV 15 Mar]* 11
Bovin Ponders Mideast Postwar Geopolitical Landscape *[IZVESTIYA 13 Mar]* 11
Paoer Notes Conflicting Reports From Baghdad *[PRAVDA 13 Mar]* 14
Ecological Group To Organize Gulf Clean-up *[TASS]* 15

East Europe

Gremitskikh Interviewed on Ties With CSFR *[Prague TV]* 15
Trade Pact With Albania Signals Shift in Ties *[IZVESTIYA 15 Mar]* 15
Visa Restrictions Abolished With Romania *[PRAVDA 12 Mar]* 16
Bulgarian President Receives Pact Official *[TASS]* 17

West Europe

Former GDR Leader's Moscow Trip Stirs Controversy 17
Warrant for Honecker's Arrest Noted *[TASS]* 17
Said to Violate FRG-USSR Accords *[TASS]* 17
Churkin Announces Soviet Position *[TASS]* 17
Nishanov-led Group Holds Talks With EC *[TASS]* 18
European Bank Head Holds Briefing in Moscow *[TASS]* 18
PRAVDA Reports on Turkish Leader's Moscow Visit 19
Talks With Gorbachev Compared *[13 Mar]* 19
Ozal's Kremlin Dinner Speech Noted *[13 Mar]* 19

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Gorbachev Invited To Head 'Union of Five' *[Moscow TV]* 22
Transcaucasus MVD Troops Message to Gorbachev *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Mar]* 22
State Bank Chairman, Deputy Appointed *[IZVESTIYA 11 Mar]* 22
Coal TU Leader on Miners' Strike Issues *[Moscow Radio]* 23
Shcherbakov on Miners Strikes, Referendum *[Moscow TV]* 24
Referendum Already Under Way in Some Republics *[AFP]* 24
Russian Voting Hours Extended *[PRAVDA]* 25
Presidential Advisor on Union Treaty *[IZVESTIYA 14 Mar]* 25
Justice Minister on Referendum Issues *[Moscow TV]* 26
Politburo Members Comment on Referendum 26
Luchinskiy on Union's Potential *[Moscow Radio]* 26
Prokofyev on Lobbying Efforts *[PRAVDA 14 Mar]* 27
Nishanov on a Voluntary Union *[13 Mar]* 28
Komsomol Urges Vote for Union *[TASS]* 29
Soyuz's Tikhonov Stresses Preserving Union *[Moscow TV]* 29
Komarov Atacks Union Opponents *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Mar]* 30
International Aspects of Referendum Analyzed *[TASS]* 32
Constructive Approach Required To End Crisis *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Mar]* 33
Republics Question Referendum's Validity *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Feb]* 34
KGB Directorate Chief on Economic Protection *[PRAVDA 12 Mar]* 35
Sobchak, Golik on KGB Draft Law Provisions *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 10]* 37
MOSCOW NEWS Editor on Domestic Issues *[Madrid EL PAIS 23 Feb]* 37
Yanayev Delivers Gorbachev Note to Composers *[Moscow Radio]* 39

Economic

Reports Note Kuzbass Coal Mine Strike Worsens 39
One-Third of Mines 'Not Functioning' *[Moscow Radio]* 39
Stocks Run Low in Kemerovo Oblast *[Moscow Radio]* 39
Donbass Committee Leaves for Kiev *[Moscow Radio]* 39
27 Mines Strike; Yeltsin on Sideline *[Moscow Radio]* 40

March Economic Trends Viewed *[MOSCOW NEWS No 9]* 40

Agriculture

Cabinet of Ministers Meets on Spring Work 41
Chernoivanov Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 41
Discussion Summarized *[TASS]* 42

Military

Army, Navy Create 20 Referendum Districts *[IZVESTIYA 13 Mar]* 42
MiG-31 Explodes on Takeoff; Pilots Killed *[TASS]* 43
Samara Exhibit Shows Military Conversion Gains *[Moscow TV]* 43

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Estonian Legislature Official Views Referendum *[Tallinn Radio]* 44
Estonian 'Intimidation' Over Poll Reported *[TASS]* 44
Estonian Presidium To Reorganize Structure *[Tallinn Radio]* 45
TASS on Latvian 'Plan' To Seize Riga TV Center 45
Latvian Official Denies Plan *[Riga Radio]* 45
Landsbergis Sees Soviet Takover After Referendum *[Jerusalem Radio]* 46
Lithuania Attempts To Halt Referendum Voting *[PRAVDA 15 Mar]* 46
Radio Vilnius on Chance for Voting Anomalies 46
USSR People's Deputies To Observe Referendum *[Vilnius International]* 47
Lithuanian CP Aide on Referendum Preparations *[PRAVDA 8 Mar]* 47
Stankevicius Cables USSR on TV Center Seizure *[Radio Vilnius]* 47

RSFSR

Yeltsin Addresses Republic on Referendum *[Radio Rossii]* 48
New Public Security Service Established *[Moscow Radio]* 53
Russia Registers Associations, Political Parties *[TASS]* 53
Polozkov Says 'No' To Running for Presidency *[TASS]* 53
Khasbulatov Signs Union Treaty Draft *[Moscow International]* 54
Khasbulatov Views 17 March Referenda *[IZVESTIYA 13 Mar]* 54
Supreme Soviet Presidium Views Referenda *[TASS]* 56
Radical Calls for Dismantling Union Scored *[PRAVDA 12 Mar]* 56
Newspaper Views Official Anti-Yeltsin Campaign *[MOSCOW NEWS No 9]* 57
Supreme Soviet's Limited Powers Noted *[MOSCOW NEWS No 9]* 59
Reportage on Russian CP Joint Plenum Session 60
Polozkov Addresses Plenum *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 7 Mar]* 60
Speeches in Plenum Debate Reported *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 Mar]* 71
Information Report on Plenum *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 7 Mar]* 75
SELSKAYA ZHIZN Report *[9 Mar]* 76

Western Republics

Union's Referendum Maneuvers in Moldova Cited 77
Poll Previews Vote *[TASS]* 77
Additional Troops Reported *[Moscow TV]* 77
'Dnestr Republic' Chairman's Status Defined *[TASS]* 78

Caucasus

Gorbachev Peace Appeal on Nagorno-Karabakh *[PRAVDA 15 Mar]* 78
Prospects for Referendum in Armenia Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Mar]* 78
Azerbaijan's Aliyev Opposes Union Referendum *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 12 Mar]* 79
Azerbaijan: Gunfire Kills 3; 'War of Stones' *[TASS]* 79

Deputy MVD Minister Gromov Visits Ossetia *[TASS]* 79
Caucasus Region Reportedly 'On Brink of War' *[TRUD 12 Mar]* 80
Kalinin Name Changed by City Council *[Yerevan International]* 81

Central Asia

Asanbayev Defends Kazakh Referendum Wording *[PRAVDA 15 Mar]* 81
Kazakhstan's Fedotova Views Referendum Prospects *[Moscow TV]* 82
Kirghiz Official Previews 17 Mar Referendum *[PRAVDA 13 Mar]* 82
Kirghiz CP Chief Urges Referendum 'Yes' Vote *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Mar]* 83
Makhkamov Advocates Union Treaty *[KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA 21 Feb]* 83
Tajikistan TV Studio Begins Broadcasting *[Moscow TV]* 84
Turkmen Legislation on 1991 Budget *[cross-reference]* 84
Uzbek President on Nationality Conflicts *[Berlin BERLINER ZEITUNG 5 Mar]* 84
Uzbek, Kirghiz Leaders View Referendum *[Moscow TV]* 86

CEMA Meeting Held 14-15 March in Moscow

Agenda Discussed

LD1403232391 Prague Federal 1 Television Network in Slovak 1830 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] A 2-day meeting of representatives of CEMA member countries opened before noon in Moscow today. Czechoslovakia is represented by Vladimir Dlouhy, minister of economic affairs. Topics under discussion include the expected termination of the CEMA, and also possibilities for creating a fundamentally new organization. Some sources do not exclude that the meeting might be limited merely to the first sphere of questions.

CEMA secretariat employees have confirmed that the Moscow meeting is attended by representatives of all nine current members.

Successor Organization Disputed

LD1503113491 Moscow TASS in English 1057 GMT 15 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Georg Mikhailin]

[Text] Moscow March 15 TASS—It has turned out that it is difficult to dissolve de jure the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) which ceased to exist de facto last year, because the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Hungary, Cuba, Mongolia, and Romania associate the dissolution of the CMEA with the need to found its legal successor—an Organisation for International Economic Cooperation (OIEC).

This was pointed out at a news conference after a meeting of the permanent representatives of CMEA member-states. The meeting ended at the CMEA secretariat today.

Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia are by no means against the new organisation which will be capable, in their view, of filling the economic vacuum in Eastern Europe. But they oppose the idea of the OIEC's becoming a legal successor to the CMEA.

These three coutries, unwilling to commit themselves to any specific obligations, come out in favour of a purely consultative character of OIEC activities, and within the geographical boundaries of Eastern Europe.

"Some countries favour open free mechanisms for regional cooperation," Bela Kadar, Hungarian minister for international economic relations and Hungary's permanent representative at the CMEA, told the news conference.

Such an approach does not suit Vietnam, Cuba, and Mongolia and—to a lesser extent—the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, and Romania. "Changes in CMEA member-states do not cancel the need for mutual cooperation in the form of consultations, the gathering and analysis of economic information, the elaboration of recommendations on the strength of these data for members of the new organisation," emphasised academician Stepan Sitaryan, the Soviet Union's permanent representative at the CMEA.

So, the CMEA countries' differences manifested themselves at this meeting as vividly as never before. The sides instructed their experts to study, within a month, the possibility of bringing the positions of the countries closer together and prepare their considerations for next meeting of the permanent representatives. The meeting is scheduled to be held in Moscow in the second half of April.

Envoy Vorontsov on UN Potential, Iraq

LD1503090991 Moscow TASS in English 0747 GMT 15 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Menkes]

[Text] United Nations March 15 TASS—New international conditions make it possible to reveal to the full the U.N. potential which was laid down by the founders of the United Nations organisation way back during the years of the Second World War, Yuliy Vorontsov, permanent representative of the Soviet Union at the United Nations, said in a televised interview.

It is the misfortune, not the fault, of the U.N. that until recently it worked under cold-war conditions, he said.

"The U.N. was contemplated as an organisation for cooperation, the maintenance of peace, and the prevention of military conflicts.

"We in the Soviet Union maybe earlier than others came to realise that the time has come now for the U.N. to show itself as a forum for genuine cooperation among nations for the good of their development and for the benefit of peace.

"Soviet proposals on ways to revive the U.N. were set out in Mikhail Gorbachev's article headlined 'Reality and Guarantees of a Secure World', dated September 17, 1987, and in his U.N. address on December 7, 1988.

"Iraq's aggression against Kuwait proved a serious test for the new spirit of cooperation at the U.N.," Vorontsov said. "The war was launched by Iraq and it was Iraq that drew upon itself retaliatory military operations by the multinational coalition. Iraq's losses are tremendous and ravages are great. All this is highly regrettable. But this is apparently the price Iraq had to pay for the aggression.

"The Soviet Union's entire policy on the issue came to the need to put a stop to the aggression by peaceful means: through sanctions, embargoes, and other methods but not through bloodshed," the Soviet U.N. ambassador emphasised.

PRAVDA Meets 'Fraternal' Press Representatives

PM1403112791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 91 Second Edition p 4

[M. Tretyakov report: "Colleagues Hold Discussion"]

[Text] The sitting of the PRAVDA editorial collegium yesterday seemed unusual. It was attended by representatives of fraternal newspapers with whom we maintain close, friendly relations.

They have come to Moscow for PRAVDA's traditional meeting of chief editors of socialist countries' and East European newspapers. Its participants come from far and wide—East Europe, Asia, and Latin America.

They do have things to discuss. Even if it is only how newspapers that retain their socialist orientation are to operate in the new conditions of glasnost, democracy, and pluralism of opinion.

Opening the meeting, I.T. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and editor in chief of PRAVDA, noted that the sociopolitical situation that has taken shape is compounded by economic difficulties—the press was after all the first to suffer from the transition to the market—and it shows that party press leaders and personnel have not always proved ready to operate in the new conditions. The decades when authoritarian regimes prevailed, leaving their mark on the style and method of activity, have taken their toll. He stressed that the CPSU Central Committee organ will continue to maintain contacts with all newspapers worldwide and above all with those whose representatives are taking part in the meeting. This cooperation should be effected on principles of complete equality.

A frank, intense discussion between journalist colleagues took place at the meeting. There have been a great many changes in the world and new problems have emerged since their previous meeting. Communist parties in a number of countries in East Europe have ceased to be the ruling parties, they have often ended up in opposition, they are operating in conditions of acute political struggle and anticommunism, and encountering serious economic difficulties. This is also bound to have an impact on the party press. It is having a difficult time now, with many financial and political problems.

Our journalist colleagues were unanimous in their opinion that such meetings are useful and that closer cooperation and mutual support should be organized in the new difficult conditions.

The meeting will continue its work today.

United States & Canada

Baker Visits Moscow Following Mideast Tour

Arrives 14 Mar, Plans Noted

PM1503140191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 15 Mar 91 p 1

[Report by A. Vasilyev: "To Tea with Shevardnadze"]

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State James Baker arrived in Moscow yesterday evening. He will be in the Soviet Union through Saturday. On Friday meetings are planned with USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh. There should also be a meeting with M.S. Gorbachev.

According to some reports Baker intends to meet with B.N. Yeltsin and also with representatives of the Baltic republics. According to a high-ranking USSR Foreign Ministry staffer, nothing specific about these points in the program is known on Smolensk Square, as the U.S. Embassy is preparing them independently. "As for the official position, it is as follows: Baker meets whoever he wants."

The unofficial part of the program also includes a meeting with E.A. Shevardnadze, who shortened his visit to Rome specially for the occasion. Shevardnadze has invited Baker to his own home. The high-ranking department staffer Denis Ross and an interpreter will visit the former USSR foreign minister with the secretary of state. Sergey Tarasenko, Shevardnadze's former closest colleague, and Pavel Palashchenko will sit down to eat on the Soviet side. This "stag party" has a special purpose: It was in just such a narrow circle that the Soviet-U.S. talks took place when Shevardnadze and Tarasenko were still working in the foreign ministry.

Bessmertnykh Describes First Talks

LD1403210591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1937 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, 14 Mar (TASS)—"What ways can be chosen by the USSR and the United States and the countries of the Middle East to ensure a reliable future for both the Persian Gulf area and the Middle East as a whole: this was the main content of my first conversation with Secretary of State James Baker, which has just ended." USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh said this to TASS correspondents immediately after the first round of Soviet-American talks ended in Moscow.

"We talked for two hours, and virtually 90 percent of that time was devoted to the problems of the Middle East and the situation which has developed in the Persian Gulf area," the minister said. "I have to note that points of contact and even identical views emerged in the course of the conversation on several approaches to problems. Of course, there are also elements which do not coincide, which is perfectly natural."

Clarifying the view which has received currency in the mass media in recent days that the United States and the USSR allegedly have independent "plans" for a post-crisis settlement of the Middle Eastern package of problems, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh said: "There is no such concept as an American or Soviet plan. It is a question of how we, our two powers, and the United Nations can promote the creation of a security system in the Persian Gulf area and the economic restoration of the region, how issues of arms supplies to that area should be tackled and what we should do with weapons of mass destruction in that area. So, it is a very broad, comprehensive approach to resolving the problems."

"On the other hand, which, I think, is becoming characteristic of talks on this subject," the minister continued, "simultaneously, we were also discussing the subject of a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East: how to move this problem forward, too. We both think, Baker and myself, even if in a paradoxical way, that the situation which has developed in the Persian Gulf, is to a certain extent creating more favorable possibilities for accelerating the search for a solution to the Middle East's problems."

Aleksandr Bessmertnykh underlined that they—these two sets of issues—"are becoming more and more logically interwoven". "Of course", he added, "each system has its own specific character, but the approach of the Soviet side lies in the fact that the security system in the Persian Gulf region should become an integral part of the settlement of the whole security system of the whole Middle East region".

Answering a question on whether the "peace in exchange for occupied territories" formula had been reflected during the talks, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh said: "We considered the UN Security Council resolutions, which do, by and large, reflect that formula. Both sides take as their starting point the view that these resolutions must form the basis of a settlement, so that in this basic respect we have a coincidence."

"We also discussed the problem of Afghanistan and several aspects connected with the search for a settlement," the minister continued. "We reached, in general, a high level of mutual understanding, and a number of factors have to be sorted out, which we are trying to do."

He also announced that the sides had begun to consider arms limitation issues, which will basically be discussed in subsequent rounds of the ministers' talks.

On the whole, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh described the first round of talks as "useful", "businesslike" and "extremely concrete", marked by "the two countries' respectful attitude towards one another". "Our cooperation remains quite constructive and, I would say, even productive", the Soviet minister emphasized in conclusion.

Talks Continue 15 Mar

LD1503110191 Moscow TASS in English 1028 GMT 15 Mar 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Georgiy Shmelyov]

[Text] Moscow March 15 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker today continued to discuss regional, primarily Middle Eastern, problems as well as disarmament issues during the second round of their talks in Moscow.

Bessmertnykh, who arrived at the Foreign Ministry's mansion for the negotiations a little earlier than his U.S. counterpart, told reporters the two were going to resume the discussion of a number of arms control issues, including conventional weapons.

For the most part, however, those problems would be dealt with by the respective working group, "which has been conducting especially intensive talks", he added.

Speaking of a settlement in the Gulf and the Middle East as a whole, Bessmertnykh said the sides "have first of all a desire to create a (security) system reliable enough to prevent situations like the Iraq-Kuwait conflict in the future".

He did not conceal that "some aspects of the problem are causing concern". "It would, in particular, be good if the security arrangement in the Gulf does not produce the impression of a closed system or be directed against anybody," Bessmertnykh said.

"It should be open to all states in the region. But since only the first steps towards such a system are being taken, I think that these concerns will be addressed later as well," he added.

Bessmertnykh repeated that the most important feature of the Moscow talks is "the sides' genuine desire to ensure a system for future security" in the region.

Speaking of other features of the talks, he pointed to "the desire to deal with the problem of reducing arms supplies to the region, which is in line with everyone's mood."

Bessmertnykh said the Soviet side did not discuss the post-crisis situation with Israel directly.

"We contacted Israel at the time of the conflict. We did not have a chance to talk to them directly, but the secretary of state told me about his talks in Jerusalem and we will also maintain contacts with the Israelis," Bessmertnykh said.

He confirmed that a representative of the Israeli foreign minister made a stopover in Moscow on Thursday to give Bessmertnykh a letter from the Israeli foreign minister.

Reporters also asked questions about the "fragility" of Soviet-American relations.

Soviet-U.S. relations have always been characterised by a certain fragility, which does not result from recent developments and is not a new discovery, he said.

"On the contrary, we have a more solid base for these relations," he said.

If discussed at all, "fragility" should be viewed in the light of positions of "certain personalities", he said.

"I believe, this is the influence of subjective factors on general trends in Soviet-American relations," he said.

U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, commenting on Thursday's talks with Bessmertnykh, spoke about considerable similarity of views on the situation in the Middle East and a Gulf settlement.

He said the sides had some problems in arms control recently.

He said he does not believe considerable progress was achieved on the issue on Thursday and that the sides should work towards progress during their next meetings.

Regional Issues Discussed

LD1503124891 Moscow TASS in English 1215 GMT 15 Mar 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 15 TASS—The just-ended second round of talks between Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker focused on regional issues, primarily Afghanistan, Central America, and Cambodia.

Bessmertnykh and Baker are now preparing for the U.S. guests' meeting with President Gorbachev. The meeting is scheduled for this afternoon.

In a talk with Soviet journalists at the close of the second round of the talks, Bessmertnykh described the forthcoming meeting with the president as the "major event" of today's agenda.

This meeting will be held in a narrow compact, two persons from each side—the president and the minister of foreign affairs from the Soviet side and the U.S. secretary of state and Dennis Ross, director, policy planning staff from the U.S. side.

A very wide range of basic issues are expected to be discussed during the meeting and first of all the future of Soviet-U.S. relations, Bessmertnykh said.

Describing the second round of talks, Bessmertnykh said that "the great difficulties were encountered during the discussion of conventional weapons".

In contrast, the broadest concurrence of views was registered when discussing Afghanistan, the Middle East, a Gulf security system and bilateral relations, according to him.

Asked about his personal relationship with Baker, Bessmertnykh said he had known him "many years" and there was not "any problem" in their relations.

"We are talking very frankly, in a trustful manner and often understanding each other before even the other has finished speaking," he said. "I would say that I picked up where Shevardnadze left off and have a very good rapport with the secretary of state."

Meets With Gorbachev 15 Mar

LD1503122991 Moscow TASS in English 1218 GMT 15 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 15 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

A meeting between President Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker has just begun in the Catherine Hall of the Kremlin here.

Mr. Baker is currently in the Soviet Union on a three-day visit.

Mideast States' Reaction to Baker Plan Assessed

PM1503100591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Mar 91 First Edition p 3

[V. Vinogradov "Commentator's Column": "Using the Chance"]

[Text] Noticeable diplomatic activity has been registered in the Near East. Its leitmotif is: "The liberation of Kuwait has created favorable conditions for a just and comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Palestinian problem." Washington, too, has joined this campaign, dispatching its Secretary of State J. Baker on a tour of a number of Near East countries.

This is understandable. The United States is by no means loath to strengthen even further its influence in the Near East which has risen thanks to the major contribution of the U.S. Armed Forces to the victorious outcome for the coalition of the war in the Persian Gulf. Travelling from capital to capital J. Baker was "pushing" a U.S. plan which essentially consisted of the proposition that the Arab-Israeli talks should be based on the principle "land in exchange for peace."

In Riyadh the U.S. emissary met with the foreign affairs ministers of eight states—Egypt, Syria, Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait, United Arab Emirates, Oman, and Saudi Arabia—who had gathered to discuss, among other issues, questions pertaining to stepping up the peace process in the Near East. While "rating highly the U.S. contribution to the liberation of Kuwait," the heads of the diplomatic departments nonetheless backed the U.S. plan only partially. They declared in a communique on the results of the meeting that they view an international conference on the Near East under the UN aegis as an acceptable framework for ending the Israeli occupation of the Arab territories and guranteeing national rights to the Palestinian people on the basis of the relevant UN resolutions.

The U.S. plan did not meet with enthusiasm in the Israeli ruling circles either. Albeit for totally different reasons. The Tel-Aviv leadership has no intention of ceding actual occupied territories for some kind of, in its opinion, mythical peace. So Prime Minister Y. Shamir declared bluntly that the Golan Heights (wrenched from Syria) are an "integral part of Israeli territory, and that the position of his government remains unchanged on this isssue." The only thing that the Israeli Government is prepared to do is to return to its own initiative put forward in 1989 which makes provision for granting only limited autonomy to the population on the occupied territories.

But this is the position of the Israeli "upper echelons" where differences, if they do exist, are limited to the question of whether negotiations should be held with the Palestinians or not. In Israeli society as such there is evidence of a profound split on the Palestinian problem, as illustrated by the results of a public opinion poll, published in the newspaper YEDI'OT AHARONOT. It appears that 49 percent of the polled Israelis favor in principle "peace in exchange for territorial concessions" to the Palestinians, while exactly the same number are opposed to this. Furthermore, 75 percent of those who took part in the poll believe that this problem should be resolved by means of a referendum, and only 24 percent would prefer the Israeli Government to adopt a decision on this. These are very eloquent figures!

What about the Palestinians themselves, who marked a few days ago the elapse of 40 months since the beginning of the intifadah! Their position has been seriously complicated as a result of the the PLO leadership's unequivocal support for Saddam Husayn during the recent conflict in the Persian Gulf. This has not only lost their just cause some of its supporters, it has also—and this is most important—deprived the PLO of the substantial financial support which it used to receive from the Arab principalities of the Gulf. But as the French newspaper LE FIGARO rightly noted, "the PLO continues to represent the Palestinians and it cannot be supplanted." Especially since, judging by appearances, the need to introduce corrections in policy is understood within the PLO. It has already been announced that its leadership intends to come forward with a new initiative on the Arab-Israeli settlement.

Our country has always favored a peaceful, just, and comprehensive solution of the Near East crisis, of which the Palestinian problem is the key issue. It sees the way to such a solution in the convocation of an international conference under the UN aegis.

Such a chance has now clearly emerged in the Near East. It would be a pity to let it slip because of someone's obduracy or intransigence. One of the most protracted regional conflicts must be settled. That is in the interests of all peoples.

Baker's Damascus Talks Emphasize UN Resolutions

LD1403184191 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1600 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Aleksandr Timoshkin commentary]

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State James Baker has ended his week-long tour of several Middle East countries where he held talks with leaders and heads of state in nine Arab countries. He also visited Israel and met representatives of the Palestinian population in the occupied Arab territories.

At the end of his tour, Baker held talks in Syria. As a result of meetings lasting several hours with Syrian President Hafiz al-'Asad, it was announced that the peace process in the Middle East must be based on UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, which call for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied Arab territories and the realization of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

Jibran Kuriyi, the Syrian president's official representative in Damascus, declared that Hafiz al-'Asad and James Baker insisted on the need to bring about a just peace in the region and to show interest in the peace process and its adequate revival. The two sides also agreed to continue their efforts in this direction and to continue bilateral relations.

The results of James Baker's talks in Damascus are particularly important to the peace process in the Middle East and its revitalization. It is known that Syria remains a firmer and more constant supporter of a comprehensive political settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, preferably within the framework of an international conference on the Middle East under UN auspices.

It is also worth noting that U.S. Secretary of State James Baker recognized the need to implement the two UN Security Council resolutions on a settlement in the Middle East. We hope Washington will not confine itself to making statements, but that it will take specific measures toward the implementation of the demands included in these two resolutions.

The position of Israel, the main ally of the U.S. in the region, on these resolutions is worth mentioning, since it refuses, as it has done before, to withdraw its forces from all occupied Arab territories. It is understood that Israel's position remains a major obstacle for a lasting and just peace in the region. It is also clear that the United States must assume the main role in the international efforts which are being deployed now in order to convince Israel to follow a really constructive path in the matters concerning a settlement in the Middle East.

U.S. Policy Shift on ABM Treaty Questioned

LD1403230491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1427 GMT 14 Mar 91

[By TASS military affairs observer Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow, 14 Mar (TASS)—There are reports from Washington that the Bush Administration does not consider the treaty that is being prepared on strategic offensive armaments "as significant a military-political symbol for ensuring security as it seemed in the past."

Exactly to what extent these reports in THE WASHINGTON POST reflect the position of the U.S. Administration on arms control issues will be shown by the future, perhaps even the next few days. There is already absolutely reliable information that a proposal has been tabled in the U.S. Senate that the 1972 Soviet-U.S. treaty on limiting ABM systems be reviewed for the purpose of giving the United States an opportunity to develop and test space-based anti-missile missiles. This proposal, if adopted by the Senate, will not be mandatory for the U.S. Administration. It is notable that a number of senators who previously opposed the Star Wars program do not object to the adoption of the resolution on the United States' virtual renunciation of the ABM treaty.

Influential circles in Washington are evidently trying to re-animate the odious aims of the "strong arm" policy even amid the real easing of international tension. This, obviously, makes one think about real U.S. military and political aims, not only in the past, but also in the future. What will happen in the world if the U.S. Administration allows itself to be led by the militant senators who, it seems, are intoxicated by the victory over Saddam Husayn, and will answer the unilateral arms reduction made by USSR and the Soviet troop withdrawal from East Europe by building up strategic offensive systems and subverting the treaty on limitation of anti-missile systems? It is quite obvious that there will not be good results either for the United States or for the rest of the world. The first casualty of such a course taken by Washington will probably be the arms control process, with all the sad consequences resulting from this.

In a recent television address, U.S. Vice President Quayle expected that in the event of the United States renouncing the ABM treaty, the Soviet Union would follow Washington's example and begin to develop its own space-based anti-missile system.

Quayle is probably a supporter of the concept of Edward Teller, a rather well-known "hawk" who used to advocate that the USSR should be drawn into developing the most expensive armaments so as to create new difficulites on the path of the development of the Soviet economy. Such expectations are totally groundless.

One should like to hope that the news that the United States is preparing to turn back from its course on "establishing the new order of peace and justice" which it has announced, toward resuming confrontation and the arms race is not true and will be denied by Washington.

PRAVDA Reports Postwar U.S. Celebration

PM1503114791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 91 Second Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent Viktor Linnik: "United States: Postwar Concerns"]

[Text] New York—Unhappy voices cannot be heard amid the praises of the President being sung today following the victorious war. What is there to be unhappy about? The economic slump? Lack of success in the fight against drug addiction? The budget deficit? A state debt in excess of $3 trillion?

All these, against the flags and yellow ribbons welcoming returning prisoners with which America is inundated, are trifles, and only an incorrigible bore can grumble about them. It is a holiday on the streets of America today and President Bush is the undoubted center of the festivities. People in America have always loved a rowdy celebration after a good fight. But this was not a good fight. The United States won victory over the world's fourth largest land army incredibly cheaply. Many U.S. ground units that entered Iraq and Kuwait after the prolonged aerial "softening up" did not fire a single shot. "We have a tougher time of it during exercises," one soldier admitted in amazement. The war was effectively won by the United States' tremendous technological superiority. "America has emerged from the Gulf war as the world's sole superpower," the latest issue of FORTUNE magazine tells its readers exultantly. "At any rate it is clear that following several years of our successes in the foreign policy arena the United States has once again taken on the role of those who now dictate the pace and order of change in the world. A malicious joke is doing the rounds of the UN lobbies: The new world order, it says, is the old world order with the Soviet Union on its knees."

The country's political landscape has changed beyond recognition. The Democrats seem to have lost all hope of returning to the White House next year. Their only chance is to persuade General Schwarzkopf to run on their party ticket, some joke gloomily. President Bush is bathed in rays of glory. His popularity rating—90 percent according to a recent poll—is a record for the last 40 years or so. Political oracles' predictions now revolve around one topic: Who will be Bush's running mate next year—General C. Powell, currently chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff? At any rate NEWSWEEK pointed out maliciously that D. Quayle's chances of keeping the post of vice president maybe only exceed those of Saddam Husayn.

Republicans are licking their lips with good reason. The task of reducing as much as possible the Democrats' advantage in the Senate and the House of Representatives is now on their agenda. Those Democrats running for reelection who voted against the immediate use of military force are being fingered as the first and—in the current order of things—natural casualties.

Against this backdrop the Democratic camp cannot find anyone willing to challenge the President next year.

On several occasions in the United States everything has changed overnight—and for equally popular presidents, too. But no one holds a magic wand. At present, all the skeptics and doubters ahead of the Gulf war are in disgrace. Moreover, some people here think that the victory train might even extricate the country's economy from the slump. The only rebuke to the White House and the Pentagon has come from former U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, who said: "They systematically and clearly overestimated Husayn. They also overestimated Iraq's military might." The subtext is clear: They could have made do with dispatching far fewer forces and, consequently, with far smaller financial expenditure. But who can answer for sure that this was not a planned miscalculation? Was the transfer of the vast troop contingent and an inconceivable quantity of combat hardware not in keeping with secret plans? After all, today U.S. troops are not in much of a hurry to return home.

Here is an interesting detail as regards secret plans. Three U.S. congressional committees intend to elucidate the role played by the State Department in "pacifying" Saddam Husayn on the eve of his invasion of Kuwait. Former U.S. Ambassador to Baghdad A. Glaspie will be a key witness at the hearings. Last July, literally a few days before the Iraqi aggression, she informed Saddam Husayn of the U.S. Government's official position (as communicated, naturally, by J. Baker). This position was quite unambiguous: America is not interested in inter-Arab conflicts, the ambassador said. Husayn unequivocally saw this statement as confirmation of U.S. neutrality in the war ahead of him. He could not have seen it otherwise. Soon after the Iraqi invasion Ambassador Glaspie was removed from her post and the State Department forbade her to talk about this extremely delicate subject. Throughout the last few months the U.S. mass media have spent day after day discussing and chewing over all aspects of the Persian Gulf problem. Only the former U.S. ambassador, who had first-rate knowledge of the true background to the events, failed to appear on television. The mass media here are well aware of the line between what is and is not allowed. "The trail (in the course of the congressional hearings—V.L.) will reach as high as Baker," an official in the Senate apparatus noted. "Either he knew about everything. Or he was simply asleep at his post."

But that is all in the future. For the time being people in America are preparing for marches and parades.

China

Rogachev, Maslyukov Continue Beijing Visit

Maslyukov Continues Economic Talks

LD1503115591 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 15 Mar 91

[Text] China will grant the Soviet Union a loan to buy Chinese consumer goods to a sum of $730 million.

According to Chinese newspapers, details of the credit were discussed at the talks of Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Yuriy Maslyukov with the premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China, Li Peng. The premier expressed the hope that the Soviet Union will be able to stabilize the political situation and speed up economic development. China will supply grain, meat products, tea, tobacco, textiles, and other goods.

Rogachev Meets Counterpart 15 Mar

LD1503111891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0930 GMT 15 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, 15 Mar (TASS)—USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev, who is currently in Beijing as a member of a Soviet Government delegation, held consultations with PRC Vice Foreign Minister Tian Zengpei on Soviet-Chinese relations and some current international problems, according to a report distributed here today.

In the course of the consultations, concrete preparations for forthcoming Soviet-Chinese contacts were discussed. A schedule for further border negotiations between the two countries was outlined. An accord was reached on holding in April the next round of talks on the mutual reduction of troops in the border area.

The situation in the Persian Gulf was at the center of the international issues discussion. Both sides found a high degree of agreement in Soviet and Chinese views on the post-crisis plans in the region.

Consultations Held on Cambodia

PM1403192991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Mar 91 Union Edition p 6

[Report by correspondent Yu. Savenkov: "Difficult Search for Compromise. Prospects for Cambodian Settlement Discussed in Beijing"]

[Text] Beijing—USSR Deputy Foreign Minister I.A. Rogachev, who is currently visiting Beijing with a Soviet governmental delegation headed by Yu.D. Maslyukov, has thoroughly discussed the Cambodian problem with PRC Assistant Foreign Minister Xu Dongxin and also met with U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Richard Solomon, who has also been in Beijing during these days.

They were meetings of professionals: Each of the interlocutors represents his own country at sessions of the "Five"—representatives of the permanent members of the UN Security Council—on the Cambodian problem. I.A. Rogachev also met with the SRV and French ambassadors to Beijing at their request.

During the talks there was a discussion of the prospects for a Cambodian settlement and of specific steps to promote the peace process. Once again the colleagues spoke of the burning need for efforts by all the Cambodian sides and interested states to achieve a political settlement. The interlocutors also touched on the SRV Foreign Ministry's recent initiative. As is known, Hanoi recently proposed that all states promote the resumption of the work of the Cambodian Supreme National Council and the resolution of internal Cambodian problems in the spirit of national reconciliation and in the name of the speediest continuation of the work of the Paris conference on Cambodia. This Vietnamese proposal spoke of the need to introduce a moratorium on military aid to all the Cambodian sides.

As is known, commenting on this Vietnamese statement at a news briefing, a PRC Foreign Ministry spokesman said that, in his view, the most pressing thing now is for all the sides involved in the Cambodian conflict to adopt a document approved by the five permanent members of the Security Council, so that the Paris conference is resumed as soon as possible. As for military aid, in his view it is just one aspect of a comprehensive political settlement.

So, during these days Beijing has been a place to meet and discuss the conflict.

R. Solomon, who ended his two-day mission to Beijing by flying off to Japan, where he intends to discuss the Cambodian topic with Japanese official circles, said at a news conference: The central task which he discussed with Chinese diplomats, Rogachev, and Sihanouk, who now lives in Beijing, was the process of peacefully resolving the Cambodian problem. Different approaches and ideas for disarming the opposing sides' military formations—this, in his view, is what is blocking the implementation of the UN plan. He refused to report just what efforts are being made to seek a way to overcome these contradictions. In his view, stabilization is needed in Cambodia: None of the sides must feel that its rival has a military advantage.

The stream of visitors to Beijing is continuing. A Japanese diplomat has also flown into the Chinese capital for talks on the Cambodian problem. He has brought with him a number of proposals aimed at implementing the UN peace plan.

Members of the opposition have also decided to consult one another. N. Sihanouk's office in Beijing has reported that a meeting of the leaders of three opposition groupings has begun in the Chinese capital.

Diplomats in Beijing hold three things responsible for such animation over a long-standing conflict. The first reason is that the Cambodian settlement, which had been put in the shade while the war was going on in the Persian Gulf, is once again coming to the fore. The second reason is that everyone realizes that the Cambodian crisis has entered a decisive phase and that it is time, at last, to find the way out of the impasse. The third reason is that Chinese diplomacy is demonstrating its activeness, and it is no coincidence that Beijing has become a venue for meetings among those involved in a Cambodian settlement.

Northeast Asia

Groundwork Laid for Gorbachev Visit to Japan

Gorbachev Greets Friendship Group

LD1403122391 Moscow TASS in English 1121 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 14 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev has sent a message of greetings to the association of Liberal-Democratic deputies of Japanese legislature. The association, called "For Friendship Between Japan and the USSR", holds a founding meeting in Tokyo today.

The message, released here, says that the association's intentions "coincide with our own desire to give impetus to Soviet-Japanese relations and to put them on a broad road leading to a qualitatively new period, in the spirit of new epoch. This is due to the objective role of the Soviet Union and Japan in the Asian-Pacific region, in international development and world affairs."

Gorbachev expressed hope that his visit to Japan "will be followed by significant changes in Soviet-Japanese relations, that our good neighbourliness will be vigorously filled with concrete contents, and the original contribution by the two influential members of the world community to the cause of world cooperation will increase".

Gorbachev said that he pays the most serious attention to preparations for the visit and plans to meet several Japanese representatives before the visit.

Bessmertnykh Invited to Japan

LD1203215491 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1430 GMT 12 Mar 91

[Text] The Japanese Foreign Ministry invited Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, head of the USSR Foreign Policy Department, to visit Japan 29-30 March. As a Foreign Ministry representative announced today in Tokyo, the main aim of the trip is to prepare for USSR President Gorbachev's first visit to Japan. Let me remind you that the summit in Tokyo is scheduled for mid-April. During talks with Japanese leaders President Gorbachev is expected to focus on bilateral relations and security issues in the Asian-Pacific region.

Japanese Premier Comments

LD1303035591 Moscow TASS in English 2038 GMT 12 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Solontsev]

[Text] Tokyo March 12 TASS— "Japan and the Soviet Union are neighbouring countries. Therefore, I think it is essential for them to establish relations based on genuine friendship and trust," Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu said in an interview broadcast by the NHK television network today.

Touching upon Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's forthcoming visit to Tokyo in April, Kaifu expressed aspiration for the visit to promote a breakthrough in efforts towards "cardinal, qualitative improvement" of bilateral relations.

"I would like the visit of the Soviet president to mark the beginning of genuinely friendly relations by resolving the problem of northern territories and concluding a peace treaty," Kaifu said.

He expressed a wish for the two sides to be cooperative during the negotiating process.

Gorbachev Seeks 'Breakthrough'

LD1503132891 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 15 Mar 91

[Text] President Mikhail Gorbachev, due to make a historic visit to Tokyo in April, is seeking a dramatic breakthrough to end a cold war stalemate with Japan, senior Soviet officials said today.

Soviet Deputy Premier Nikolay Laverov and Valentin Falin, a senior Communist Party official, called on Japan's prime minister with a message that Moscow hoped for an era of better ties, a government official said. The two leaders told Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu that President Gorbachev was ready to make a breakthrough in Japan-Soviet ties during his visit, due on 16-19 April.

Meanwhile, the Soviet foreign minister, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, will arrive in Tokyo on 29 March for three days to raise the final groundwork for Mikhail Gorbachev's visit, Soviet Embassy officials said today. Aleksandr Bessmertnykh will meet Prime Minister Kaifu and Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama to work out the wording of a joint communique to be issued at the end of Mikhail Gorbachev's stay. Japanese Foreign Ministry officials announced a provisional schedule that has Mikhail Gorbachev meeting Kaifu three times and paying a courtesy call to Emperor Akihito.

'Favorable Environment' Questioned

OW1403095891 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 10 Mar 91

[Dmitriyev commentary]

[Text] A Soviet-Japanese foreign ministerial meeting was held in Moscow in late January, and it seems like an event of only yesterday. Immediately following that, a meeting of the two countries' joint economic committee was held in Tokyo, the working-group meeting for a peace treaty was held in Moscow, and then the two cities of Niigata and Vladivostok established sisterhood relations.

This was followed by visits to Japan of Mr. Primakov, a distinguished Soviet statesman and a member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences; Minister of Culture Gubenko; Mr. Frolov, a CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and chief editor of PRAVDA; Belorussian

Republic Premier Kubich; and delegates from Skahlinsk Oblast. Soviet Deputy Premier Laverov is also scheduled to visit Japan soon. Of course, these exchanges are being made in preparations for President Gorbachev's visit to Japan, and these visits show that the Soviet side attaches great importance to the president's visit to Japan.

The Japanese side is taking due steps on its part. For instance, the Japanese Government has decided to provide tax breaks for funds that private Japanese companies will provide to the Soviet Union through the Red Cross, according to a Japanese newspaper report. Major Japanese companies and banks recently formed an organization to promote investments in the Soviet Union, and a group of prominent Japanese politicians established a committee to organize welcome events for President Gorbachev.

Incidentally, a recent issue of PRAVDA carried President Gorbachev's replies to questions from representatives of Japanese business circles. These representatives, in their message sent earlier, presented ideas about expanding reciprocal exchanges.

All this has happened over a very short period of time. I think this, in fact, proves that both sides hope that President Gorbachev's visit to Japan will lead to real improvement in bilateral ties and that both sides are making efforts to create a favorable environment for that. In general, it can be said that sufficiently favorable environment is being created by the spirit of constructive goodwill.

Can we call it a trend that will not retrogress? At present, in the background of the trend are mutual goodwill and hopes pinned on the Soviet top leader's visit to Japan, first such in history. But what will substantiate this goodwill and hopes? New mechanisms for dialogue, like the working group for a peace treaty, have been formed. Many agreements for cooperation in various fields have been concluded, and they have become a high-level [word indistinct] on intention to make efforts for improved relations. Of course, these developments give rise to hope. But I think that we need an additional guarantee for the Japanese-Soviet relations to make positive development without retrogression.

There is no doubt that a peace treaty will be able to provide such a guarantee. Then, can we expect the treaty to be concluded in the near future? Observers mostly give a negative prospect in view of the fact that the Soviet Union and Japan have differences of views over the territories issue. Pessimistic views became stronger in the wake of the recent working-group meeting for a peace treaty. Japanese observers have concluded that progress for a settlement of the territorial issue is difficult to achieve because of the domestic situation in the Soviet Union. A similar view was also explained by Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman (Sanov) during his recent interview. I think it is wrong to view the situation with extreme pessimism. First, although there may be a reason to connect the territorial issue to the difficult Soviet domestic situaton, it is not strong engough to exclude the likelihood of making progress in general. Second, there is a possibility that approaches may be made after the situation is normalized. Thus, it can also be said that the results of recent diplomatic contacts give us hope under certain circumstances. I think that people were disappointed that excessive expectations were placed rather on an early settlement of the issue. Moreover, I also think that there is no need to exaggerate influential power of the Soviet military for an attempt to apply the breaks to this [sentence as heard]. For example, President Gorbachev's adviser General Akhromeyev in a recent KYODO interview explained his flexible stance, saying that he would support relevant clauses of the 1956 Japanese-Soviet Joint Declaration. Thus, it is possible to take some positive steps forward in this field. It is particularly so because, as the Japanese side admitted, the entire [word indistinct] relations was limited to the joint declaration. I hope that such an understanding will be completely realized when President Gorbachev visits Japan in April.

There is no doubt that progress in every direction, including cooperation in the fields of economy and culture, and dialogue on the security issue will be beneficial to the people of both Japan and the Soviet Union.

Economist Eyes Continuing Kuril Disputes With Japan

LD1503101891 Moscow TASS in English 0922 GMT 15 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Belovitskiy]

[Text] Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk March 15 TASS—The south Kuril Islands are a Soviet territory and will remain as such, Valentin Fedorov, a noted Soviet economist, who was elected the chairman of the Sakhalin Regional Executive Committee last year, told TASS.

"To the Soviet side, there is no problem in this respect," Fedorov said. "The fact that we take into account the Japanese side's concern and look for a mutually acceptable way out must be appreciated by our neighbours."

He suggests his own concept of a way to resolve the dispute over the four south Kuril Islands. The essence of the concept is to include these islands and part of Hokkaido, for example, into a single free economic zone, with them remaining part of Soviet and Japanese national territory respectively. The zone will be also open for third countries' participation in its development.

"We must get away from defensive conditions in which we have found ourselves under the pressure of the Japanese side. We are waiting for a response to our move," Fedorov said. "Such cooperation would have far reaching positive consequences also from the viewpoint of regional demilitarisation.

"Maybe, some people in Japan are shocked or feel hurt by this idea. But one should come to realise that we are

similarly hurt by demands for the relinquishment of Soviet sovereignty over the Kuril Islands," Fedorov said.

The Sakhalin island leader considers is utterly inadvisable to hold any referenda in Sakhalin region on the future of the Kurils. He believes that "there are no ambiguities as regards the south Kuril Islands".

Even if efforts to establish large-scale cooperation with Japan fail now, Fedorov believes, it is essential to equip oneself economically, creating a market economy in the Far East and Soviet islands in the "area, predominantly a semi-closed type of a market economy at first, so as to compete on a par with the Japanese open economy subsequently.

"Our country is now in a difficult position. But this does not mean anything historically. The current transitional situation does not give us any grounds to relinquish part of our national territory," Fedorov said.

He now has the highest popularity rating among Sakhalin region leaders, enjoying the backing of an overwhelming majority of Sakhalin and Kuril constituents.

Laverov Attends Technological Exhibition in Tokyo

LD1003100291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0917 GMT 10 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Bantin]

[Text] Tokyo, 10 Mar (TASS)— Nikolay Laverov, deputy prime minister of the USSR and chairman of the State Committee for Science and technology, arrived in the capital of Japan today on a seven-day visit.

He will attend the opening in Tokyo on Tuesday of a seminar-exhibition of Soviet technology, which will continue until 14 March. During his stay in Japan, N.P. Laverov will hold a series of meetings with representatives of the government and business circles of the country.

Near East & South Asia

Israeli Foreign Ministry Official Visits

Meets With Belonogov 14 Mar

LD1403122491 Moscow TASS in English 1200 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 14 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Belonogov today received visiting Director-General of the Israeli Foreign Ministry Re'uven Merhav,. who conveyed to Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh a message from Israeli Foreign Minister David Levi.

The two men discussed in detail the situation in the Middle East and the Gulf. Special attention was paid to goals of general improvement of the regional situation through the earliest settlement of the crisis.

First and foremost, it involves a just and cardinal solution of the Middle Eastern problem which will help remove the main cause of mistrust and enmity between the countries and peoples of the region.

Speaks With Bessmertnykh

LD1403201391 Moscow TASS in English 1956 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 14 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministr Aleksandr Bessmertnykh today received Israeli religious leader S. Cook. The sides discussed the situation in the Middle East and Soviet-Israeli relations.

The meeting was attended by representatives of U.S. religious and non-government circles, including New York City Council member N. Dier.

Belonogov Arranges Israel Visit

TA1503110491 Tel Aviv MA'ARIV in Hebrew 15 Mar 91 p A1

[Report from Moscow by Walter Ruby]

[Text] Last night, in the talks held in Moscow between Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksander Belonogov and Foreign Ministry Director General Re'uven Merhav, the two concluded that a group of Soviet Foreign Ministry personnel will soon visit Israel.

In the meeting, which lasted three hours and was termed friendly and extensive, it was decided that the delegation will come to Israel probably in May. This will be the first visit by Soviet Foreign Ministry experts to Israel since the relations between the two countries were severed in 1967.

In the discussion, Merhav raised the issue of the Arab countries' procurement of upgraded weapons. Belonogov expressed his opposition to the Middle East arms race, but was not ready to make a commitment that in the future Moscow would abstain from a renewed armament of Iraq or any other Middle East country.

Bovin Ponders Mideast Postwar Geopolitical Landscape

PM1403121991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Mar 91 Union Edition p 6

[Article by political observer A. Bovin: "After the Crisis"]

[Text] We had all become nervous. The Kuwait crisis was taking its course, and we were already being intimidated with the prospect of World War III, a universal ecological disaster, wholesale deaths from the use of chemical, bacteriological, and even nuclear weapons, and a worldwide economic crisis. All this was possible. But politics deals solely with likelihoods.

The crisis is now over. We are now being intimidated with its possible consequences. Either the Americans will firmly entrench themselves in Saudi Arabia and the

Pentagon will open a branch in either Mecca or Medina. Or Islamic fundamentalists will blow apart the Arab world, which is drifting toward the West, and cut the oil arteries feeding the Western economy. Or Soviet Muslims will rise up....

But let us not bother to investigate scenarios whose degree of likelihood under the present specific historical conditions is close to zero. Let us evaluate more real prospects.

I believe that the Kuwait crisis, which pushed the USSR and the United States toward cooperation at a critical time, will intensify the erosion of the lines dividing the world into East and West and will still more clearly mark the trend toward limiting the influence of competing ideologies on international relations. A bipolar world is being replaced by a multipolar world in which confrontation between two antagonistic systems is giving way to rivalry among a multitude of interests in different directions, which leaves ample scope for mutual understanding and cooperation. The bipolar world is not disintegrating symmetrically. The East's positions have been weakened, but the West's positions have been preserved. This asymmetry has been underlined and reinforced by the Kuwait crisis. The United States is emerging from it in the halo of undisputed victor and leader of the anti-Iraq coalition, which numbers almost 30 states, as a great power in all respects (military might, economy, political influence, internal stability). Against such a background the Soviet Union's positions have plainly faded. For some time our missiles and our ideas (the new political thinking) enabled us to speak on equal terms. As internal chaos intensifies, however, the intellectual component of our "great power" status is noticeably being reduced to naught, and you cannot get far with missiles alone now.

The Americans are undoubtedly experiencing a tremendous temptation to increase pressure on Moscow. Both in order to "argue" something out of talks for themselves and in order, if Moscow takes up "united and indivisible" positions and if the rolling back of democracy begins, to increase our isolation in the world community and to close channels of economic cooperation. Of course, there is no need to adapt Soviet policy to Washington's tastes. It must be "adapted" to our state's chief, fundamental interests, to our principled choice. I am beside myself when I hear or read how people are "choosing" over and over again between Gorbachev and Yeltsin. The fact that Polozkov is increasingly confidently settling in the other pan of the scales somehow takes a back seat and disappears from view behind the disputes between Gorbachev's supporters and Yeltsin's. Polozkov does not fear an "intensification of the class struggle" either within the country or in the international arena. he will not give Bush any quarter....

But let us return closer to Kuwait.

In a world where there was rivalry between two ideological and political poles, each one endeavored to win over the largest possible number of allies. The arms trade served as one of the most important means of doing this. Each armed primarily "its own." During 1982-1989 alone Saudi Arabia and Iraq received almost one-third of all the weapons sold to "third world" countries. Specifically, the Saudis bought weapons worth $44.2 billion, and Iraq—$42.8 billion, more than half of which was supplied by the Soviet Union. Then things happened almost according to Chekhov—if weapons exist, they start to shoot.

Therefore one of the chief lessons of the Kuwait crisis is to resume the Soviet-U.S. talks on the arms trade. A very difficult problem. It is possible, let us assume, to eliminate ideological motives, but economic motives remain, particularly for us. Yet we must try.... For the dust has not yet had time to settle in the desert, but Saudi Arabia is asking for weapons worth $14 billion, the United Arab Emirates $5 billion, Egypt $3 billion, etc. Will it all be repeated again from the beginning?

The certain easing of East-West tension and the general stabilization of the situation in the North contrast noticeably with the course of events in the South, which, as borne out once again by the Kuwait crisis, still remains a source of conflict situations and crises. Previously these conflicts and crises either had their roots in the East-West struggle or were intensified, maintained, and prolonged by East-West confrontation. Now conflicts in the South, in the "third" world, are increasingly frequently of a local, regional nature. The North has ceased to reconcile itself to the South's chronic instability. The ending of the cold war enables the former enemies to pool their efforts to smooth over conflict situations and defuse crises.

Thus, the North (the "East" plus the "West"), by resuscitating the long-incapable United Nations, is acting as a stabilizing force with regard to the South. This is happening either on the initiative of the parties to the conflict or with their consent. Nevertheless, those who are being helped far from always feel a profound affection for those who are helping. The "others," with whose help they have to beat "their own," always remain "others."

The Kuwait crisis is a typical example. Some Arabs called in the Americans to punish others. The Americans coped brilliantly with the assignment. What now? The kings, shaykhs, and presidents who invited a mercenary military force do not feel very comfortable beside their rescuers. The defeat of Iraq by "infidels" gives rise to a sense of shame and impotence in many people in the Arab world. Thus, representatives of the Syrian intelligentsia and culture, for example, (I will remind you that H. al-Asad is a leading figure in the anti-Iraq coalition) disseminated an appeal which read: The war "damages not only Iraq but also the future of all Arabs. This is why any Arab, regardless of who he is and what his potential is, must hold this criminal U.S. action up to shame."

Washington understands this, although maybe in a somewhat mitigated version. The U.S. Armed Forces have already begun to withdraw. But, as for the Navy and Air Force, attempts will evidently be made to leave part of them. It is proposed to make a regional inter-Arab security system the basic structure. In fact, it has already been created. The Arab states of the Persian Gulf have reached agreement with Egypt and Syria: The former provide the money, the latter the military guarantees.

Italy's proposal is interesting. Rome proceeds from the premise that the time has come not to just patch the latest hole but to arrive at a new logic and new rules governing relations between the European world and the Islamic-Arabic world (North Africa, the Near East). In this connection it is proposed to utilize the experience of the Helsinki process and to consider the possibility of convening a Mediterranean conference. Why not? It would do no harm and might be of benefit.

If Europe is ripe for such a step, however, it is hard to say this as yet about the Islamic-Arab world. It is too disunited. The Kuwait crisis, despite the almost monolithic unity of the facade, has increased the disunity and added new cracks in the Arab world.

Today it is possible to note the strengthening of so-called moderate Arab states, which initiated the washing of Arab dirty linen in public. Radicals have been left in a minority. But the situation is different on the lower and middle floors of the social edifice. Very many people are dissatisfied. Arab nationalism is uniting with Muslim fundamentalism, and in the long term an explosive mixture of great force could be formed. Underground shocks are already being felt in a number of countries.

In the opinion of M. al-Qadhdhafi, the Lebanese [as published] leader, "the only correct way out of the present situation is a unified Arab state. If there were such a thing, there would be no attack by one Arab country against another because there would be nothing called Kuwait or Iraq." In this connection M. al-Qadhdhafi rejected as unsound the claims of the existence of economic, social, and cultural differences among Arabs. "The mythical borders between Arabs can be destroyed in a single day, and this must be done without delay." M. al-Qadhdhafi emphasized that rulers who will oppose "Arab unity must be overthrown, because the interests of the Arab nation are above the interests of individuals." Ringing words, but empty ones....

The postcrisis time is a time for healing wounds. It will take Kuwait several years to extinguish the wells, restore the oilfields, and rebuild the capital. There are a lot of people wishing to make money.... The most respectable firms which have gotten a good name, i.e. U.S. ones, are winning.

Political problems are more complex. Kuwait is a monarchy. An enlightened one, let us suppose, but far removed from democracy. There was a legislature, but it began to be self-willed, and the amir dissolved it. He managed without a legislature. The sharp turn in the life of the country has exacerbated all problems, including the problem of democracy. The struggle for a more open and more modern society has appeared on the agenda. Unexpected things are possible on this path.

Iraq's problems are more acute, tangled, and contradictory. On the one hand, the restoration of equilibrium (in particular, the need to have an Arab counterweight to Persian Iran) rules out the preservation of a weak Iraq while, on the other, no one knows where the limit of permissible force, that is not dangerous to neighbors, lies. On the one hand, it will require vast sums to eliminate the aftermath of the war and, on the other, Iraq must bear responsibility for the losses and damage caused to Kuwait and to third states as a result of the aggression. On the one hand, the Husayn regime is glaringly at odds with democratic principles and convictions. On the other, the elimination of the regime could bring about dangerous and uncontrollable consequences, even including civil war and the country's disintegration.

By placing the region of the Middle and Near East at the center of the world community's attention, the Kuwaiti crisis has made people look closely again and again at its sore points.

In particular, the unexpected turn of events could result in an uprising by Iraqi Kurds, particularly if it is supported by Kurds in Iran, Turkey, and Syria. A veil of silence was long ago drawn over the problems of Kurdistan because of circumstantial political considerations. But the Kurds have not gone anywhere, they exist, they are continuing the struggle under the constant pressure of terror....

The Lebanese tragedy long ago surpassed all the bounds of common sense. The Lebanese themselves, their patrons, and those whom Lebanon has given a roof over their head are all tearing the country apart with some pathological frenzy. You do not know what to hope for: Maybe that agreement among all five permanent members of the UN Security Council will cease to be the exception and become the rule and enable this organization not only to proclaim peace but also to establish it....

Finally, the Palestinian question and the Israeli occupation of the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip. The package of problems of the Arab-Israeli conflict is a kind of "eternal engine" of the mutual enmity which has split the age-old inhabitants of Palestine.

Contrary to repeated statements by S. Husayn, there is no logical link between the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait and the Israeli occupation of the West Bank, for pandering to one occupier cannot justify pandering to another, as S. Husayn would like. But the actions of Israel and those of Iraq undoubtedly have something in common: Force flouts the law, force sets itself up above the law.

The fact that a seizure of foreign lands happened long ago does not legalize it. Israel must get out of the territories occupied in 1967. Nor is there justification for

the Arabs' actions back in 1947-1948, when they rejected the UN General Assembly decision on the partition of Palestine and went to war with Israel. That was how the present phase of the conflict began.

How is it to be ended? It is hard to say yet.

The positions of Israel, which—under pressure from the Americans, it is true—was still able to show outstanding restraint and not respond to the Iraqi missile strikes, have improved somewhat. The United States feels indebted to Israel and will not pressure it.

The authority of the Palestinians' leader has fallen sharply since Y. 'Arafat unconditionally supported S. Husayn.

The positions of Jordan, vacillating between Iraq and the anti-Iraq coalition, have been weakened.

Syria alone, probably, feels more confident. "Only what can it do alone...."

What picture is it possible to form from such "blocks"?

An algebraic formula is recognized by ourselves, the Americans, and the Arabs—to give up territories for peace. The complexities begin when it is concretized. Of course Israel wants to secure peace. But it does not want to give up territories, particularly as there is an intention to organize a Palestinian state on them. Let us assume that an international conference on a peaceful political settlement in the Near East meets under the auspices of the UN Security Council. It is possible to say in advance that a positive result will not be obtained. What is needed is painstaking diplomatic work, a "glass bead game," [reference to "game" played in Herman Hesse novel "Magister Ludi" in which dissonance is slowly resolved into order], not an open forum for polemics.

In general, according to the data of political astrology, the resolution of the Near East conflict lies outside the 20th century.

While journalists and theoretical politicians are writing articles on the topic of "after the crisis," practical politicians are preparing to change the military and political parameters of the region. Although, frankly speaking, I see no preconditions for major, qualitative changes.

For understandable reasons the Americans are out in front. As early as 7 March U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker set off on a tour taking in Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Syria, Israel, Kuwait, Turkey, and the Soviet Union. I would like to think that Soviet diplomats will also be seized by a desire to head for foreign lands. If, of course, there are interesting ideas....

Paoer Notes Conflicting Reports From Baghdad

PM1503105591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 91 Second Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent Andrey Stepanov: "Iraq: Between War and Peace"]

[Excerpts] Amman—Some 60 foreign correspondents in Iraq have left Baghdad by order of the authorities. It is not a matter of how they covered events in the war. Their Iraqi colleagues told those uninitiated into the political decisionmaking mechanism here that this does not merely constitute a change of correspondents but a revision of the entire propaganda approach.

While bombs and missiles were raining down on Baghdad the task was to demonstrate to the representatives of the mass media—and, through them, to the whole world—the allies' barbarity and to show that peaceful inhabitants were suffering and that it was not only military installations that were being destroyed. With the cease-fire and the Iraqi Army's effective defeat this topic has been played out, and the large reporting fraternity has tried all manner of ways to get a fix on the domestic political situation, to get hold of information on what is happening in the country, despite the strict censorship, and to decide whether the regime will survive after its crushing defeat—and, if so, for how long.

Naturally, the authorities took objection to this and, since reliable communications between areas of the country had been severed, general suspicion and edginess increased. Meanwhile Western agencies, citing anonymous eyewitnesses and intelligence sources, have reported that mass disturbances provoked by the religious extremist organization headed by the frenzied Ayatollah Muhammad Baqir al-Hakim have flared up in a dozen or so cities in the south, in particular Basra and Karbala'. The protesters against the authorities' policy have reportedly been joined by certain army units. These reports indicate that insurgents operating in the north have meanwhile captured several cities and the densely populated areas of al-Sulaymaniyah and Erbil. [passage omitted]

The situation in Baghdad is also unstable, hovering between war and peace. Reports coming in are extremely confused and contradictory, and rumor cannot by any means compensate for the lack of trustworthy information. As for the official assessment of events, it was set out by Hajji al-Hadithi, head of an Iraqi Ministry of Information department. In particular, he said that the conspiracy against Iraq was contemplating the formation of a kind of puppet government—made up of opposition figures who have long since sullied themselves by cooperating with Western special services—in southern areas which U.S. forces have temporarily cut off from the rest of the country. This plan aims to introduce civil war elements into the domestic political situation. But, according to Hajji al-Hadithi, these attempts are doomed to failure because any alternative government can only be maintained by foreign soldiers and will

collapse as soon as the allied troops withdraw. What is more, pressing for the maintenance of the economic blockade, and profiting from the difficulties and shortages that this has generated, the United States is endeavoring to spur on the antigovernment demonstrations. But, according to our interlocutor, at this difficult time the Iraqi people are rallying even more closely around their leadership and will foil all the enemy forces' machinations.

Similar assessments can be encountered everywhere. Admittedly, not everyone agrees with them. Against the backdrop of increasing difficulties the people above all feel tremendously weary of war and the endless slogans. Although confidence is expressed that the Iraqi authorities will succeed in dealing with the revolts, the country's future is extremely hazy. In any event, however, the fact is still indisputable that the Iraqis themselves have to decide their future, and that regional problems cannot be resolved without taking Baghdad's opinion and position into consideration.

Ecological Group To Organize Gulf Clean-up

LD1503100891 Moscow TASS in English 0852 GMT 15 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Borisov]

[Text] Moscow March 15 TASS—The Soviet foreign economic ecological association Ecolas is ready to offer its services in removing the Gulf war ecological aftermath, a TASS correspondent has been told by Ecolas General Director Professor Viktor Akovetskiy.

In the professor's opinion, the Ecolas association, instituted by 35 leading Soviet enterprises and organisations, including defence and cosmic ones, has at its disposal all the necessary technical facilities and a wealth of experience to solve such a large-scale problem.

If the relevant sides are interested in the proposal, Akovetskiy said, Ecolas could already start in the near future monitoring of the ecological condition in the region. Ecolas will be able to use the most up-to-date methods and facilities for observations and data processing, including remote sounding complexes, installed aboard the Soviet orbital station Mir, the artificial earth satellites Resource-01 and the research ship Akademik Aleksey Krylov.

Ecological charts and Gulf environmental condition models will be made, to be followed by specific proposals on ways of removing the Gulf war ecological aftermath.

A number of Western firms, among them the Swiss firm Leica, have expressed readiness to carry out the work jointly with Ecolas.

East Europe

Gremitskikh Interviewed on Ties With CSFR

LD1403235491 Prague Federal 1 Television Network in Slovak 2115 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Interview with Yuriy Gremitskikh, deputy head of the Information Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, by an unidentified correspondent, in Prague on 14 March—Gremitskikh's speaks in Russian with superimposed Czech translation]

[Excerpts] [Correspondent] [passage omitted] We asked about the Soviet Union's postwar political and diplomatic activity, and about the Soviet side's view of the developments of the situation in the Middle East.

[Gremitskikh] Our activity will be no less intense than it was during the war conflict. The Soviet Union has traditionally good relations with Arab countries, and now, when official contacts with Israel also have been established, the country is not so cut-off from the continent. Our southern border is less than 200 km from there. That is also why we are interested in directly participating in all the postwar talks and in putting across our system of views during those talks, doing away with all weapons of mass destruction from this region, and, in this way, within the all-European process, providing a good example for peaceful solutions to international problems. [passage omitted]

As far as the relations between the center and individual republics—above all between Gorbachev and Yeltsin—are concerned, they are problematic, and these problems are not at all insignificant. The last speech by Yeltsin provoked an unfavorable reaction by our population. I am aware of the fact that Boris Yeltsin is preparing for a trip to Czechoslovakia and, therefore, you should ask him directly about these issues. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent] The discussion also touched upon the subject of the culmination of nationalist conflicts within our country. In this context, Yuriy Gremitskikh said that the speculations about the Soviet Union supporting Slovak separatism are nonsense. Answering a question of whether there is any possiblity that the Soviet Army would intervene in the solution of domestic as well as foreign political problems in its own particular war, the Soviet guest said: No, the Army is under the control of legislature.

Trade Pact With Albania Signals Shift in Ties

PM1403193791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Mar 91 Union Edition p 6

[Interview with Ye.I. Osadchuk, USSR deputy minister of foreign economic relations, by correspondent S. Afonin; place and date not given: "USSR-Albania: Encouraging Changes"]

[Text] As already reported, the first long-term agreement on trade, economic, and technical cooperation between the Soviet Union and Albania for 30 years has been signed in Tirana. A protocol on trade and economic cooperation between the two countries in 1991 was also signed. Ye.I. Osadchuk, USSR deputy minister of foreign economic relations, who signed these documents for the Soviet side, granted an interview to IZVESTIYA's correspondent.

[Afonin] Yevgeniy Ivanovich, can we say today that at long last there are changes in Soviet-Albanian relations?

[Osadchuk] The chief thing is that direct bilateral ties are being resumed in all the main areas of Soviet-Albanian relations. As is well known, the Soviet Embassy's first group recently arrived in Tirana, and questions of preparing for the opening of our trade mission are also being tackled.

I must point out that people in the People's Socialist Republic of Albania, as in our country, attach special significance to cooperation with the Soviet Union. In the past, as is well known, this cooperation helped to accelerate Albania's socioeconomic development and to create a whole number of sectors of industry—the energy, metalworking, textile, and woodworking sectors. The oil, mining, and coal industries enjoyed further development with the USSR's technical assistance, and dozens of enterprises were constructed—a textile combine in Tirana, an oil refinery at Cerrik, a number of hydroelectric and thermal electric power stations, a woodworking combine at Elbasan, a sugar refinery at Maliq, and others.

This is not to mention the fact that hundreds of Soviet specialists worked selflessly in various spheres of the Albanian national economy during those years. Thousands of skilled workers were trained with their assistance. It is particularly important that good memories of the previous stage of economic cooperation have been preserved in Albania as the basis for its resumption and development.

Today both the Soviet Union and Albania have taken practical steps toward each other. I would say that in this sphere we are moving to a qualitatively new path for the revival of our relations. Great prospects for the development of trade and economic and technical cooperation between our countries are being opened up in connection with the signing of the aforementioned intergovernmental documents.

I must point out, above all, that the agreement envisages new elements in keeping with the contemporary conditions of economic ties: the use of current world prices and the conducting of transactions in freely convertible currency throughout the range of our trade and economic relations. An accord has been reached on the delivery from the USSR this year of a blend of coking coals, ferriferous raw materials, ferrous and nonferrous metallurgical products, lumber, mineral fertilizers, spare parts for various machines and equipment, and also individual consumer goods. It is proposed that Albania will in turn supply our country with goods essential to our national economy which are traditional Albanian export items. These are, in particular, fresh and canned vegetables and fruit, cognac and wine, tobacco and cigarettes, construction materials, medicinal herbs, and much else besides.

I must emphasize that the lists of goods appended to the protocol on trade and economic cooperation between the USSR and Albania in 1991 are not of a limiting nature. Both sides have agreed to take measures to constantly extend their range.

[Afonin] You said that transactions will be conducted in freely convertible currency. Since there is an acute scarcity of such funds in both countries, will barter deals be used in our relations?

[Osadchuk] We realize that the mechanism of economic cooperation requires that actual conditions be taken into account, and its joint elaboration is continuing.

[Afonin] Were questions connected with economic and technical assistance from the Soviet Union in the construction of new projects and also in the reconstruction and modernization of those constructed earlier with the assistance of Soviet organizations touched on in Tirana during the talks?

[Osadchuk] Work will undoubtedly be carried out between the USSR and Albania in all sorts of areas. We primarily discussed assistance to Albania in developing and modernizing the mining industry, power generation, transportation, the industry for the production of construction materials, and agriculture by means of deliveries of complete equipment and the training of specialists.

Soviet specialists plan a trip to Albania in the very near future to study technical aspects of the possible participation of Soviet organizations in work on the construction and modernization of a whole number of enterprises. An accord has also been reached on the joint creation of the necessary conditions for the establishment and activation of direct ties between our countries' enterprises and organizations.

In conclusion I would like to point out that the Soviet side is sure—and this was confirmed by Albanian comrades—that the friendly relations and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Albania will not only develop steadily for the good of both countries but will also serve the cause of peace and cooperation in Europe.

Visa Restrictions Abolished With Romania

PM1503105791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Mar 91 Second Edition p 5

[Report by correspondent V. Vedrashko: "No Visa Required"]

[Text] Bucharest, 11 Mar—A Soviet-Romanian intergovernmental agreement abolishing visa arrangements was signed in Bucharest this morning. The moment it enters into force, and that will be 30 days after the relevant notes have been officially exchanged, citizens of both countries will be able to travel to, pass through, and stay in the other country without a visa for a period of 90 days on existing travel documents (primarily diplomatic, official, or general passports). These terms do not apply to citizens who wish to travel to another country to work or to take up permanent residence.

Bulgarian President Receives Pact Official

LD1303214691 Moscow TASS in English 2119 GMT 13 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Stepanenko]

[Text] Sofia March 13 TASS—All valuable and rational aspects in relations between Bulgaria and the USSR will be preserved, said Bulgarian President Zhelyu Zhelev at today's meeting with Ivan Gashkov, representative of the commander-in-chief of the Warsaw Treaty united armed forces.

Gashkov informed the president that the Warsaw Treaty military mission in Bulgaria would be closed on March 15.

The meeting was attended by Bulgarian Defence Minister Yordan Mutafchiev.

West Europe

Former GDR Leader's Moscow Trip Stirs Controversy

Warrant for Honecker's Arrest Noted

LD1503085891 Moscow TASS in English 0831 GMT 15 Mar 91

[Text] Berlin March 15 TASS—Former East German state and party leader Eric Honecker is currently in the Soviet Union, his lawyer Nicholas Bekker told the DPA news agency today, quoting Soviet military sources.

Honecker was flown to Moscow following a sharp deterioration in the state of his health, Bekker said.

Doctors at the Soviet hospital in Beelitz registered a considerable disruption in Honecker's cardio-vascular and kidney activity, which required his transfer to a specialised medical institution, according to spokesmen of the Soviet Western Group of Forces in Germany.

On November 30, 1990, Berlin's Supreme Court issued a warrant for Honecker's arrest, accusing him of responsibility for the killings of defectors attempting to cross East Germany's border.

On Wednesday [13 March] Honecker was delivered to Moscow for emergency medical aid, officials at the Berlin branch of the Soviet Embassy in Germany told TASS.

Said to Violate FRG-USSR Accords

LD1503103791 Moscow TASS in English 1014 GMT 15 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Chistyakov]

[Text] Bonn March 15 TASS—The German Government was informed that former German Democratic Republic Leader Erich Honecker was in the Soviet Union for treatment, spokesman Dieter Vogel told reporters on Thursday night.

In the first half of the day on Wednesday the Soviet ambassador to Germany informed German authorities about the decision to move Honecker to Moscow for treatment in a specialised hospital, due to a sharp deterioration of his health, Vogel said. On Wednesday, Honecker was flown to the Soviet Union.

After intensive consultations on all legal and foreign policy aspects of the event the German Government explained corresponding legal norms to a representative of the USSR Embassy on Thursday night and expressed hope that Honecker would be "immediately" returned to Germany.

The Soviet Government should know that an arrest warrant has been issued on Honecker in Germany, Vogel said.

The decision to move Honecker to the Soviet Union violates the Soviet-German agreement on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Germany and international laws, the spokesman said.

Churkin Announces Soviet Position

LD1503142591 Moscow TASS in English 1402 GMT 15 Mar 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Mikhail Ivanov, Aleksandr Kanishchev, and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow March 15 TASS—German Chancellor Helmut Kohl was informed through his aide that former leader of East German Erich Honecker had left Germany for the Soviet Union, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin told a briefing here today. He also said that the Soviet side was guided first of all by humanitarian motives.

Elaborating on the position of the Soviet Union in this affair, Churkin said that "we are aware of statements made by Germany in this connection. We informed the German side about our intention through Chancellor Kohl's aide several hours before Erich Honecker left Germany for the Soviet Union. The federal chancellor was informed that Honecker would be transferred to Moscow."

"We pay due attention to the German side's statements on the issue. It should be taken into account that our actions were motivated primarily by humanitarian reasons—Honecker's serious condition (?and) the need for

special cardiotreatment, which cannot be provided in the hospital of the Western Group of Soviet troops," Churkin said.

"Therefore, if there is a violation of the treaty on the terms of the temporary stay and gradual withdrawal of Soviet troops from Germany, which has yet to be ratified by the Soviet legislature, it is a technical mistake caused by force-majeur circumstances," Churkin said.

"Honecker cannot now return to Germany because of his condition. We believe the German side will consider the humanitarian aspect that stands behind our actions," Churkin said.

Nishanov-led Group Holds Talks With EC

LD1403085191 Moscow TASS in English 0715 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Paris March 14 TASS—A Soviet legislative delegation, staying in Strasbourg within the framework of the third USSR-EC interlegislative meeting, attended sessions of the European legislature panel for relations with the Soviet Union on March 11-13. The Soviet delegation is led by Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Council of Nationalities.

In a detailed exchange of views with members of the Europarliament representing the electorate of 12 European Community member-states, Soviet deputies informed them of the course of perestroyka processes and the internal political situation [words indistinct].

During discussions, Eurodeputies raised a number of acute issues connected with the situation in the Baltics, Nagorno-Karabakh and South Ossetia.

The Europarliament attaches much importance to the Soviet Union's active involvement in the CSCE process and intend to promote the success of activities planned within the CSCE framework.

The discussion of prospects for the USSR-EC cooperation in the trade-and-economic field from the viewpoint of the Soviet Union's increasing involvement in the integration processes in Europe figured prominently during the talks.

The Eurodeputies expressed readiness to promote a prompt consideration by the Europarliament of matters connected with the rendering of the EC's food and technical aid to the Soviet Union and the provision of EC guarantees of credits to the USSR for the purchase of food.

The two sides reaffirmed readiness to place contacts between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Europarliament at panel level on a regular systematic basis which, according to general opinion, will meet the interests of invigorating the constructive dialogue between the USSR and the EC.

European Bank Head Holds Briefing in Moscow

LD1403124191 Moscow TASS in English 1153 GMT 14 Mar 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Sergey Postanogov and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow March 14 TASS—"Meetings with representatives of the Soviet leadership and talks with them helped me to specify the basic principles of democracy and a market economy which are to be implemented," Jacques Attali, president of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), told a news conference here today.

Attali is currently in Moscow on an official visit at the invitation of Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov.

"The EBRD is the first international financial institution, of which the Soviet Union is full and equal member," Attali said.

Speaking about EBRD activities, Attali stated that the bank aims to help its members during transition to democracy and a market economy and in the establishment of institutions necessary for that and renders technical assistance in the development of infrastructure and private sector.

The need to effect reforms in the USSR in the form in which they were decided upon by the Soviet authorities and with due regard for EBRD recommendations was emphasised during contacts with the president of the USSR, the prime minister and other representatives of the Soviet side, Attali said.

Evaluating at TASS request the chances of the Soviet Union's integration into the world economy, Attali said that it is important the Soviet Union "harmoniously" join it, since the country possesses an immense potential. Should this be successful, he said, the European continent will become an important element in the world economy. This would meet the interests of universal peace as well, he added.

For a country to integrate into the world economic system, it is essential to create a clear-cut concept of basic reforms—macroeconomic stabilisation, price liberalisation, and property reforms leading to market relations, Attali believes.

The Soviet leadership prefers a combination of a market economy and democracy, Attali noted. He drew this conclusion on the strength of his talks with President Mikhail Gorbachev, the prime minister and the chairman of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers.

The USSR will hardly copy any of Western models of market economics, Attali emphasised.

Speaking about transformations being carried out in the USSR, Attali stressed that "they should be an integral part of a well thought-out and uniform global policy".

PRAVDA Reports on Turkish Leader's Moscow Visit

Talks With Gorbachev Compared

PM1403111991

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 13 March 1991 in its Second Edition on page 1 carries a TASS report on the second, final meeting between USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and Turkish President T. Ozal 12 March in Moscow. The PRAVDA item, entitled "Close of Talks Between M.S. Gorbachev and T. Ozal," has been compared with the Moscow TASS Russian version published in the 13 March Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, p 19, revealing the following variations:

Column one, paragraph one, PRAVDA begins: [Text] The second and... (omitting words)

Sentence two reads: ...USSR and Turkey.

During their thorough conversation they reached... (substituting "thorough" for "detailed")

Paragraph two, sentence two reads: ...idea that the ideas and practice of... (substituting "ideas" for "ideals")

Column two, paragraph one, last sentence reads: ...settlement of the problems the country is... (substituting "problems" for "issues")

Final paragraph, last sentence reads: ...accepted with gratitude.

The following took part in the talks: on the Turkish side—G. Taner [name as transliterated], A.K. Alptemocin, and N. Zeybek [name as transliterated]; and on the Soviet side—A.A. Bessmertnykh, N.N. Gubenko, K.F. Katushev, and V.V. Zagladin.

On the same day Soviet-Turkish documents were signed in the Grand Kremlin Palace.

The two countries' presidents—M.S. Gorbachev and T. Ozal—countersigned the Soviet-Turkish Treaty on Friendship, Good-Neighborliness, and Cooperation.

An agreement between the USSR Government and the Turkish Government on trade, economic, and scientific and technical cooperation and an intergovernmental agreement on avoiding double taxation as regards income tax were also signed. They were signed by K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations, and G. Taner, Turkish minister of state, and by USSR Finance Minister B.Ye. Orlov and Turkish Foreign Minister A.K. Alptemocin respectively. (adding four paragraphs)

Ozal's Kremlin Dinner Speech Noted

PM1503133191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report of speech delivered by Turkish President T. Ozal 12 March in the Grand Kremlin Palace at a dinner given in his honor by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev under the general heading: "USSR-Turkey: New Milestones"]

[Text] Your Excellency Mr. President!

I thank you for your warm words. I would like to take this opportunity to voice my heartfelt thanks for the hospitality accorded to me, my wife, and the members of the Turkish delegation.

Your Excellency!

This visit to your country is my first visit as president—prior to this a Turkish president last visited the Soviet Union 22 years ago—and I hope that future summit-level contacts between our countries will be more frequent. This is because—apart from being a great state—the Soviet Union is above all our neighbor whom we value highly and to whose friendship we attach great importance. With this thought, we are convinced of the need to work to ensure that our relations constantly develop in an upward direction. Starting in 1986 when I visited your country as prime minister, we have made noticeable progress in this area. I see opportunities for our relations to progress still further in the course of this visit and this gives me great satisfaction.

A particular point is that this visit coincides with an important date—the 70th anniversary of the Moscow Treaty of 16 March 1921. This treaty has hitherto been an element of stability for our countries during times of trouble experience by the countries of the region and by European states.

In this respect our signing of the Treaty of Friendship, Good-Neighborliness, and Cooperation, coinciding as it does with the anniversary of the Moscow Treaty, is fresh evidence of the sides' political will to continue to act in this vein.

Your Excellency!

The words "glasnost" and "perestroyka" are now known to everyone—both worldwide and in our country—since it is due to these political approaches and the new thinking, which enabled them to spread to the sphere of international relations, that we have come to witness extremely important events over the last few years and this has strengthened international peace. I want to say that we are all full of profound respect for the fact that you took your courage in your hands and took charge of the pratical implementation of these political approaches.

Important events are, indeed, taking place today, changing the course of history irrevocably. This process is accompanied by great upheavals. The old structures are collapsing. A quest for new organizational forms and concepts of security is under way. In this context we regard the Paris CSCE meeting in November 1990 as a turning point in European history. We attach tremendous significance to the documents adopted in the course of this meeting.

There is no doubt that our countries will play an important role in the Europe of the future. Our cooperation will indisputably reinforce efforts designed to establish stability and cooperation in central and Eastern Europe and on the Balkan peninsula and will help implement the ideals of the Paris Charter.

Our countries share an important element in that they form a bridge between the European and Asian areas of the globe, spanning—as they do—both continents. That is why our cooperation will represent an important contribution to ensuring peace and stability not only in Europe but also in the Near and Middle East and in Western Asia.

We are watching with satisfaction the Soviet Union's implementation of the principles of glasnost, perestroyka, democratization, respect for human rights, and freedom of conscience, along with the political measures being implemented within the framework of its contemporary political approach to nationalities questions. We think that secular democratic Turkey can orient the development of its relations with the Soviet republics—with which it has special historical and cultural ties—within the framework of these principles.

Your Excellency!

During the past seven months many efforts were made on our part to ensure that the Persian Gulf crisis did not develop into war. In this connection I would particularly like to stress the feelings of approval with which we perceived your intensive efforts in the interests of preserving peace. Unfortunately, it did not prove possible to secure the desired result owing to the Iraqi leadership's uncompromising position. One can only be pleased that the military operation ended within a short period and was followed by a cease-fire. Kuwait has been liberated from foreign occupation and regained its independence, as envisaged by the UN Security Council resolutions. Thus the international community has clearly shown that it will not allow the international legal order to be flouted and will not tolerate the pursuit of a policy of faits accomplis.

The immediate task now is to provide the requisite conditions to establish a stable, lasting peace in the region and overcome the grave consequences of the crisis. In this context we are convinced that the territorial integrity and independence of all countries in the region must be respected.

It is our sincere desire that Iraq also immediately take its place in the international community as a respected, stable country committed to the principle of the rule of law.

We are convinced that the formation of a situation in the region ensuring rapprochement between the region's countries on the basis of their common interests and stimulating their economic interconnection would help establish a stable peace in the region. In this connection, in the context of joint capital investments to create the infrastructure, along with questions of oil and gas pipelines, I ought to mention our plan to construct a "pipeline of peace" to convey water, thus solving the problem of the region's water supply.

Your Excellency!

Our side has, for various reasons, voiced the opinion that efforts must be made to settle the Near East problem following the Persian Gulf crisis in the interests of establishing a lasting peace in the region. In this connection Turkey is prepared to do everything in its power—including holding an international conference in our country—to examine this problem, if it is deemed advisable to convene a conference of this kind.

Your Excellency!

For 27 years now it has proved impossible to settle the Cypriot problem owing to the stance of the Greek Cypriots, who are striving to unilaterally decide the island's future. It is well-known that this problem stems from a breach of the political partnership between the island's two equal peoples.

The political equality of the Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots is the most important element of the Cypriot problem. The Greek Cypriot leadership cannot represent the island as a whole and its two peoples. I would particularly like to point out that any approach or method of settlement not based on the principle of equality would be unsuccessful or ineffective.

The Greek Cypriot side is pressing on in its endeavor to resolve the problem in the international sphere by propaganda and pressure. Focusing these efforts on the aims envisaged by UN Security Council Resolution No. 649, which was adopted within the framework of the good offices mission and of the UN secretary general [as published], will undoubtedly open up the way to a settlement.

The Turkish Cypriot side is continuing its cooperation and contacts with the UN secretary general. These contacts have ensured the attainment of a new important stage in shaping the foundations of a settlement. We hope that proper significance will be attached to this favorable factor.

Turkey favors settling all its issues with Greece by means of dialogue and bilateral talks. We believe in the need for good-neighborly relations with Greece and hope that there can be serious dialogue.

Your Excellency!

We are profoundly delighted by the rapid changes that have taken place over the last few years in our trade and economic relations. Our trade turnover—which was until recently modest—totaled $1.8 billion last year. We have planned a level of $5 billion over the next two or three years. We believe that the economies of our countries, which are mutually complementary, possessing a

wealth of natural resources, industrial infrastructures, and a skilled work force, will enable us to considerably top this level.

Turkey also attaches great important to developing bilateral trade and economic relations with neighboring Soviet republics. We believe that the agreements on littoral and border trade and on cooperation in the sphere of communications and transport, along with the opening of new border entry points, will by and large make a positive contribution to the development of Turkish-Soviet relations.

We have followed with attention and interest the Soviet Union's efforts to restructure its economy. As you know, Turkey has gone a considerable way toward ensuring an industrial upsurge and the transition to a free market economy; it has been successful in this and acquired important experience. The last decade particularly may serve as an example to other countries. This is also borne out by requests from other countries, above all our neighbors, to utilize our experience. Of course, every country has its own specific conditions and problems. We think that the experience that Turkey has acquired over the last ten years under the new conditions is realistic and more effective from the viewpoint of the possibility of covering—in a very short period—a stage which took the West 100 years to overcome. In this respect we think that Turkey's accumulated potential of knowledge and its technological material may serve as an interesting and, possibly, beneficial example for the Soviet Union. In this connection I would like to say here once again that we are prepared for all-around cooperation with the friendly Soviet Union.

Your Excellency!

When speaking about economic relations between our two countries, I would particularly like to dwell on the plan to form a "Black Sea area of economic cooperation." This plan aims to render the Black Sea a sea of peace, stability, and prosperity in conditions where panhuman values have become widespread in Europe and the platform of security and cooperation has broadened. Our governments must undoubtedly resolve important tasks in the context of this cooperation and the efforts being made, including as regards shaping conditions to provide incentives for citizens' entrepreneurial activity and facilitate relations between them, and also to create the requisite infrastructure for this. Our aim must be to stimulate vigorous activity on the part of people from all strata of society in our countries, paying top-priority attention to individual free enterprise and freer movement of goods, services, and capital. We are convinced that this is how we will not only further develop and diversify economic relations, but also facilitate the Black Sea area's integration into the European and world economies.

Your Excellency!

We are satisfied with the favorable development of Turkish-Soviet cultural relations. Both countries' rich history and cultural legacy create unprecedented opportunities to raise this dimension of our relations to a fitting level. In this context last year's agreement on cultural cooperation and the signing of a cultural exchange program this year have created a good foundation for our countries' people to get to know one another better and to strengthen mutual understanding between them.

Our proposed conclusion of new cultural exchange programs with the republics of the Transcaucasus and Central Asia, with whom we maintain close and sincere relations, will be a factor in the further strengthening of ties between the peoples of these republics and Turkey.

Your Excellency!

The new forms of cooperation that we are introducing to Turkish-Soviet relations will not only accord with the interests of our peoples' well-being and prosperity but will also contribute to the cause of strengthening peace in the region and worldwide. I see there is the political will to make fresh efforts and strengthen the growing mutual understanding in our relations of friendship and cooperation and I would like this visit to be an event that reinforces the hopes for the future of our relations.

I have already said and I express the hope that there will be regular visits at this level in the future. We will be very delighted to see you, Your Excellency, and esteemed Mrs. Gorbachev in Turkey in the very near future.

Ladies and Gentlemen!

Filled with these feelings and thoughts, I propose that you raise your glasses to the health, happiness, and further success of esteemed President M.S. Gorbachev and esteemed Mrs. Gorbachev, to the prosperity and well-being of the peoples of the Soviet Union, and to the future of friendship and cooperation between our countries.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Invited To Head 'Union of Five'

LD1503124191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 15 Mar 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev has been invited to head the so-called Union of the Five: a union including Russia, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan. The offer was made on behalf of Boris Yeltsin and Nursultan Nazarbayev. The president of Kazakhstan confirmed this joint offer recently. This is reported by the NOVOSTI agency citing KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. Mikhail Gorbachev's reply is not known yet.

Transcaucasus MVD Troops Message to Gorbachev

PM1503104591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Mar 91 First Edition p 1

["Address from delegates to the party conference of the USSR MVD Internal Troops Transcaucasus Combined Unit to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee"—place and date not given]

[Text] The Communists of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Internal Troops Transcaucasus Combined Unit in this complex and difficult time for the party and state believe that it is essential to state their loyalty to the socialist ideals inscribed on the banner of Great October. Furthermore, the attempts of the leaders of pseudodemocracy (Comrades B. Yeltsin, A. Sobchak, and G. Popov) to drag the Army and primarily the internal troops into the sphere of their adventurist policy aimed at undermining the bastions of statehood and destroying the USSR are vain today.

In response to Yeltsin's inconsistent and inflammatory appeal to the servicemen in the Baltics, calling on them to avoid fulfilling their military oath, we say a resolute no! We have one motherland—the USSR. Its property has been paid for by the blood of many generations. We have sworn loyalty to it, and to it alone did we give our oath "... to be devoted to our last breath to our people, our Soviet Motherland, and the Soviet Government."

Our people are magnanimous, sensible, and wise, and they will yet find out who champions the interests of the power and who is already selling off its assets wholesale and retail.

Aware of our duty, we cannot remain neutral today regarding the way in which representatives of a number of democratic movements are openly calling for reprisals against the Communists and are desecrating monuments and our values won by the Soviet people during their hard history.

Under these conditions, we view inertia, occasional flirting with the opposition, and political improvisations in its favor as the CPSU Central Committee's inconsistency in implementing the political line of the 28th CPSU Congress and as your irresoluteness as its leader.

Remaining loyal to the ideas of October and to our military oath, we want to state our position at this complex and fateful moment:

1. We support you as USSR president and as general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in implementing more resolute steps to stabilize the situation in the country.

2. We advocate the conservation of the USSR as a renewed federation of equal sovereign republics.

3. We are against the changing of the sociopolitical system.

4. We are against the rule of the worker and peasant class being replaced by a class of merchants and entrepreneurs.

5. We are against the pointless weakening of the state's defense capability, the further fueling of anti-Army sentiments, and attempts to depoliticize the Armed Forces, MVD bodies, KGB, and other state structures.

6. We demand the adoption of resolute and urgent measures to halt the activity of the destructive forces that are splitting our society and pushing it toward the abyss.

7. We appeal to you and to the CPSU Central Committee demanding that you become aware of the acuteness of the moment, emerge from your state of rigidity, and, as was the case before, lead the healthy forces of society along the path chosen by the country in October 1917.

State Bank Chairman, Deputy Appointed

PM1403133191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Mar 91 Union Edition p 3

[USSR Supreme Soviet resolutions on USSR State Bank Appointments]

[Text]

On Appointment of Comrade V.V. Gerashcheko as chairman of the USSR State Bank

Having examined the submission from the USSR president, the USSR Supreme Soviet decrees:
that Comrade Viktor Vladimirovich Gerashchenko be appointed chairman of the USSR State Bank.

On the Appointment of Comrade V.N. Kulikov as first deputy chairman of the USSR State Bank

Having examined the submission from the USSR president, the USSR Supreme Soviet decrees:
that Comrade Valeriyan Nikolayevich Kulikov be appointed first deputy chairman of the USSR State Bank.

[signed] A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR SUpreme Soviet. Moscow, Kremlin, 7 March 1991.

Coal TU Leader on Miners' Strike Issues

LD1403193291 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Vladimir Georgiyevich Lunev, chairman of Central Council of Coal Industry Workers' Trade Union, interviewed by unidentified correspondent; place and date not given—live or recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Vladimir Georgiyevich, today's press reports about the strikes underway at the pits have greatly alarmed probably not only us but indeed the whole country. I do not know, but how many mines are now striking in the Kuzbass?

[Lunev] Eighteen today.

[Correspondent] Eighteen.

[Lunev] By this morning there were about 50 coalmines on strike, that is, throughout the entire country.

[Correspondent] I think it would be of interest and essential for our listeners to hear from you what has caused this situation.

[Lunev] The main demand is for an increase in earnings. To our mind earnings are not in line with today's standard of living. Second, earnings do not correspond to the difficulty and danger of the coalminers' work. Food rationing has been introduced in the Kuzbass, the Urals and at Inta. The ration is unfortunately very low, while because of the characteristics of his labor the miner must expend somewhere around 4,500 kilocalories. This is around twice as much as a person engaged in, say, administrative work. Accordingly he requires a corresponding quantity of food to restore his strength. Where does he obtain this? In the market. This is the reason for the demand for an increase in earnings.

We are working with the government on this issue. I cannot say that the government has refused us. There has been a special order from the Cabinet of Ministers approved by Comrade Ryabev, its deputy chairman, which instructs the State Committee for Labor and Social Issues and the Ministry of the Coal Industry—with our participation—to draw up proposals during the March-April period on significantly increasing earnings, and to present them on 25 May for approval by the Cabinet of Ministers. However, on account of the complex and extreme situation, it has been decided to bring forward the deadline and to finish this work in April.

[Correspondent] Do you support these strikes or are you opposed to them?

[Lunev] We support the economic demands that are being put forward in these strikes. We support them, but at the present time I consider that those bodies that have proclaimed strikes and appeared within the collectives are hindering us from holding constructive and difficult negotiations with the government. Why is this so? In the Kuzbass the strike was proclaimed by the Council of Kuzbass Workrs' Committees. In the Donbass it was the Regional Council of Donbass Strike Committees. At a number of mines it has been the Independent Trade Union of Coalminers, while at some mines people's deputies have been calling on work collectives to strike. You can see just how many bodies have been calling for a strike and starting them. A strikes is an extreme measure that should be undertaken in a fully conscious and well-prepared way only after all possible means have been exhausted. It is a truly very grave economic trial for the families of the mines, for the miners themselves, and indeed for the enterprise itself. One should not kill off the enterprise where one works.

We have a hard and difficult but constructive dialogue underway with the government. Over the past week we have resolved a whole number of issues, but at present there is a very great deal of politicking around the miners. This pains one.

[Correspondent] What would you like to say about the irreconcileable positions of some miners on strike who have said that they will not end the strike until a decision is also taken on the position of the country's leadership?

[Lunev] In the final analysis everyone needs to seek a compromise solution. I see this as the only way to a solution of the matter. For this, we need to immediately sit down at the negotiating table, at which we might seek solutions; all the country's miners should learn how the negotiations are faring, what results we have achieved, what we have accomplished, and what they will receive.

[Correspondent] Probably you have calculated how much money would be needed to satisfy the demands of the miners.

[Lunev] If earnings were to be increased 2.5-fold, it would require R14 billion. If they were doubled, it would be around 9 billion.

[Correspondent] Perhaps, however, at the present time, in conditions of conversion these R14 billion could be taken from defense and given to the miners, because I reckon that at present we are losing R14 billion, but in the future, if this strike escalates and is extended to metallurgy, machine-building, textiles and other industries, we shall lose not 14 but maybe 50, maybe 100, or maybe 200 bilion, not to mention the moral side of the issue.

[Lunev] Well, we should probably lose not 100 or 200 billion, we should simply bring our country to a standstill. There is, as they say, a grain of reason in your proposal, and we shall be putting forward this proposal.

[Correspondent] Well, what would you like to say again to the country's miners?

[Lunev] Thank you for the provision of this opportunity by all- union radio. We are working, and I should like the miners to believe that the central council has adopted a firm position. I ask the comrade miners to get down to work trust the central council, and believe that we shall acheive a solution of all the issues raised by the miners.

Shcherbakov on Miners Strikes, Referendum

LD1503113591

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian in its "Television News Service" program at 1905 GMT on 14 March carries a 13-minute interview with V.P. Shcherbakov, chairman of the General Confederation of USSR Trade Unions, by V. Vishnevskiy. The subject of the interview is the referendum to be held on 17 march.

Shcherbakov begins by stating that in the past trade unions in the USSR did not do their job properly. Now all that has changed: Soviet trade unions, he says, support the idea of holding a referendum on the future of the Union. It has always been their view that the people should be consulted, through referendums when needed, on all important questions. Shcherbakov says that it was the view of the 19th Trade Union Congress that the Union is needed. This is the way to defend people's economic interests and things will only get worse if the Union collapses, he states. Shcherbakov points to the example of the EC, currently busy integrating its economy. He contrasts this with the Soviet Union, where efforts are being made to divide everything along ethnic lines. Ordinary people suffer as a result, he says, and criticized the war of laws and the war of sovereignties, both leading to a sharp drop in living standards.

Shcherbakov goes on to talk about the attitude to the referendum of the Moscow Trade Union Federation. It is proposing a three-point referendum in Moscow. Should there be a Union? Should there be an elected Russian president? Should the leader of Moscow be elected? The federation is calling for an affirmative vote on all these. Shcherbakov describes these proposals as a compromise and praises the Moscow approach.

Vishnevskiy then says: "Vladimir Pavlovich, I would like your answer to the following question. People are annoyed, to a certain extent, at the moment. Maybe they are right to be annoyed. What about those people who are on strike at the moment? Will they turn out for the referendum? What is your view? The second question: You say that the trade unions' job is to defend the interests of the working people. Do you believe that the referendum will defend the interests of the working people?"

Shcherbakov responds by justifying the government's right to adjust prices if necessary, provided adequate compensation is arranged. He goes on to say: "You ask me about the striking miners. Yes, miners are on strike at individual mines in the Donbass. Strikes are also being staged in Vorkuta and in the Kuzbass. Yes, these strikes are taking place. Yes, the wages of miners certainly must be improved and raised. Yes, the living conditions of miners must be improved. They must be given greatly improved social security. They are working in extremely difficult conditions and, of course, they deserve a far better deal. Naturally, the miners see that, although their work is extremely hard and their life is quite poor and bad, there are, unfortunately, other categories of people in our country who contribute less but live no worse than miners. In this respect the miners can and must be understood.

"Without question we favor stabilization measures in the economy, compensation for people for the extra expenditure they will incur as a result of changes in price-setting, with the introduction of a law on indexation, with the introduction of a subsistence minimum. We ask—rather we do not ask, we demand, and insistently ask, that the government define clearly and succinctly what the subsistence minimum is 70 rubles. They don't need this deception. firm, precise, and clear calculations must be made and announced. In this region the subsistence minimum is such-and-such. In that region it is such-and-such. But, unfortunately, today we cannot achieve this subsistence minimum only 70 or 80 percent. In a year or two we will reach a figure of 90 percent. I think it would not be quite right if we did not make any attempt to calculate this subsistence minimum but, instead, relied on the subsistence minimum of 70 rubles set 20 years ago. We cannot agree to such a position.

"You ask me whether they will turn up or not. I simply call on all working people to turn up and express their views, to express their support for our Union, for our efforts to halt the decline, the deterioration in the state of our economy, and to start stabilizing and improving it. If we do not earn wealth, if we do not create material wealth, there cannot, naturally, be any improvement in our living standards." [Video shows Vishnevskiy outside Trade Union headquarters in Moscow, then cuts to Shcherbakov's office for the interview]

Referendum Already Under Way in Some Republics

AU1503091691 Paris AFP in English 0845 GMT 15 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, March 15 (AFP)—Voting in the referendum on the future of the Soviet Union has already started in a number of republics where local authorities are officially boycotting the poll, official sources said here Friday.

More than 1,000 polling stations are now open in the six republics—Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Moldavia, Armenia and Georgia—which are refusing to organize Sunday's vote, referendum central commission information director Pavel Zobnin told AFP Friday.

These polling stations are located in Moscow-controlled factories, army garrisons and Russian-speaking districts, the official added.

The referendum started early because many factories where polling is taking place are closed at the weekend, Mr. Zobnin said.

In Moldava, a republic bordering Romania, nationalist ethnic Moldavans blockaded one polling stations in Kishinev, the capital, after 1,276 people had voted there Thursday morning, TASS news agency reported Friday.

The independent Vilnius radio station said polling stations had been opened in the Lithuanian capital, including at its railway station and airport. Transit passengers were being invited to take part, the radio alleged.

President Mikhail Gorbachev is asking people to say whether they want the country "preserved as a renewed federation of equal sovereign republics".

Russian Voting Hours Extended

PM1503120791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Mar 91 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Commission Session Held"]

[Text] At a regular session in Moscow 14 March the USSR Central Referendum Commission registered the district and precinct USSR referendum commissions set up in individual republics on the initiative of local soviets and labor collectives.

As a TASS reporter was told at the Central Commission, it has been agreed that polling hours for the USSR referendum may be extended on Russian Federation territory to 2200 hours local time as stipulated in the Law on the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Referendum.

Presidential Advisor on Union Treaty

PM1503104391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Mar 91 Union Edition p 1

[G. Alimov report: "How Should the New Union Look"]

[Excerpts] Vitaliy Ignatenko, assistant to the USSR president, held another briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists 12 March. Grigoriy Revenko, adviser to the head of state, also participated in it and answered many questions on the draft of the new Union Treaty. [Passage omitted]

Then G. Revenko, adviser to the USSR president, answered numerous questions from journalists. The results of the referendum and the movement toward the Union Treaty, in his opinion, are now determining the whole political, public, and moral life of the country. He gave a detailed account of the progress in the work of the republics' official representatives on the draft Union Treaty. G. Revenko recalled that official representatives of 26 republics—eight union republics and 18 former autonomous formations—participated in it and signed the protocol. Representatives from Azerbaijan participated as observers and, as G. Revenko put it, "they were close to signing." As has already been reported, the three Baltic republics, Georgia, and Moldova, and Nakhichevan and Adzhar Republics did not participate in this work.

What Does the Signing of the Protocol by 26 Republics Mean?

If you are talking in political, economic, and social terms, then, when definitive accord is reached between republics on all points, this means the following. It means 97.7 percent of the country's territory, over 91 percent of the USSR's population, and 91-92 percent of all types of output including agricultural and industrial output, the gross national income, and so on. Those who sign the Union Treaty, G. Revenko said, will start forming a political, economic, and cultural space. It will probably have a number of advantages—privileges, single union tariffs, and so on. In this situation, the others will have to think about how to behave. According to the adviser to the USSR president, relations with them will be constructed for a specific period within the framework of the existing Constitution and legislation.

Will the USSR Preserve its Name?

G. Revenko cited the name of the country and the Union Treaty as figuring among the most controversial questions. In his opinion, it is not the aim of the upcoming referendum to find the actual name. There is one aim—to obtain confirmation from the people as regards the preservation of the integrity of the Union. And the country's name is the prerogative of the new Constitution. And it is not decoded in the draft of the new treaty. G. Revenko expressed the opinion that the country might be called a federative state of sovereign republics.

When Could the Treaty of Sovereign Republics Be Signed? [subhead]

According to G. Revenko's predictions, the draft treaty, which has been sent to the republic Supreme Soviets, will probably be examined by parliaments in the space of a month, and when the opinions of the republic Supreme Soviets have been taken into account, everyone will be instructed to meet again and elaborate a final formula for the treaty. Then the Council of the Federation will specify a time and define its position vis-a-vis the sp-called Congress of Representatives, or a congress that will finally sign the Union Treaty.

The Argument About Autonomous Republics

This is one of the sharpest questions on which there is still no accord. This is a subject that politicians on all sides are taking advantage of, G. Revenko said. They exploit it as much as they can, each to his own ends. He resolutely rejected accusations that the center has something to gain from this problem. No, he said, there were pioneers here who offered the autonomous formations as much sovereignty as they could take. This is just the

implementation of the policy they were calling for, G. Revenko said. That is why today there is talk about the fact that after the former autonomous formations declare their sovereignty, they justifiably strive for participation in the structures of union power and demand this from the union republics. For example, Tatarstan is declaring its complete autonomy within the framework of the Union. But on the other hand, the current union republics, and particularly the ones where there are no autonomous formations, are expressing the worry that there will be an excessive prevalence of delegates from Russia for instance, in the Union Supreme Soviet. Here there are 16 republics that are subjects of the treaty and the federation. This question will most probably be resolved by introducing quotas or by making more precise the mechanism for the functioning of the chambers of the union parliament.

Justice Minister on Referendum Issues

LD1403215791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 14 Mar 91

[USSR Minister of Justice S.G. Lushchikov interviewed by correspondent S.Suntsov; place and date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Suntsov] Sergey Gennadiyevich, the all-Union referendum taking place on 17 March is the first such in our country, and it will decide a key issue. At the same time a number of republics have refused to hold it. How do you view this situation?

[Lushchikov] I can say unambiguously that it is not a normal situation when the supreme bodies of authority of individual republics refuse their people the right to express their attitude on such a key issue. We are talking about democratic changes, we are talking about movement toward a law-based state, and the normal expression of will is being hampered while the state is doing these things.

From the point of view of the law, the law allows a referendum to be carried out in individual labor collectives, individual regions and finally in military units. There should be no obstacles to this situation.

[Suntsov] Certain views say that as a result of holding the referendum, divisions in society are increasing. To what degree is this view justified?

[Lushchikov] There are several factors. There are several atttitudes. Certain individual political leaders, maybe, are following their own ambitions in calling on people not to vote in the referendum, or to vote against the Union. Today it is necessary to understand that by voting for the union we are voting for a new union. But one thing—we must act with legal methods, constitutional methods, and avoid completely unnecessary confrontations.

Politburo Members Comment on Referendum

Luchinskiy on Union's Potential

LD1403161191

[Editorial Report] Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian at 1215 GMT on 14 March carries a 12-minute live or recorded interview with Petr Kirillovich Luchinskiy, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, by correspondent Vladimir Perfilyev.

Answering Perfilyev's question about the party's approach to the referendum, Luchinskiy begins by saying that referendum is a new concept in our political life, allowing people to freely express their will. "We have become accustomed to always having things resolved for us by someone else. Now, to a large extent, we are still in this situation. We think along these lines: Well, what will change just because I vote yes or no? But one must realize that a great deal will now change, precisely now, if we all come to understand that a great deal depends on our personal attitude, that the way things develop in the state depends upon it. Yes, there is a great deal with which we are currently dissatisfied, there are very many hotbeds of tension and of head-on clashes and so forth—but it is necessary now to somehow rise above all these events of today and to imagine that we must determine the way forward in the future: together, or each going hiw own way? this is the most fundamental aspect."

Luchinskiy recalls that Russia has already experienced this headlong rush toward independence after the revolution, when almost every region wished to become a state, with all the trappings thereof. It was only after the first euphoria subsided that people realized that strength was to be found in unity.

Replying to Perfilyev's question about the likely consequences of voting no, Luchinskiy says that there would be a further polarization of views, more dissent, and problems would become exacerbated. "We are changing our state and its relationships, and within this in-depth process now under way in this country, within this process of breakup, people come into conflict, and so do vested interests—after all, in front of our very eyes people now get killed, shot at and so forth. But this anguish may become incomparably greater. Currently we are, to a large extent, exposed to it through the medium of television, and we hear about it on the radio; but tomorrow this anguish may visit our home, it may happen on our street, and everyone ought to understand that, now."

Paradoxically, continues Luchinskiy, we will be united anyway. Appeals to frustrate the referendum are undemocratic, while the referendum itself is an instrument of democracy par excellence. What purpose could last Sunday's rallies have pursued, creating a semblance of Russian-wide unanimity against the referendum? he asks. It was a destructive purpose in a situation in which integration processes are under way throughout the

world. It is clear, in this context, that we will become united anyway, says Luchinskiy. But must it be done through fighting, must it entail bloodshed? Here it is essential for the people to show its wisdom. Each must know that the future depends on how he votes, he says.

Perfilyev then asks how the party organizations are preparing themselves for the referendum, and goes on: "Last Saturday, speaking at the Dom Kino here in the capital, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin was very flattering about party secretaries who, in his words, come up to every person, skillfully carrying out the agitation work. Is it indeed the case that agitation work has been arranged so well by the party activists?"

Luchinskiy replies: "The point is that we, for example, are, on the contrary, not satisfied with the way we are working. This is something well known. There was this period of confusion and numbness, because, let us be blunt, none of us is accustomed to such methods of working, when they grab you by the throat, or else they phone you and threaten you and, let us say, call you to turn up at a meeting and to be present at it without fail—we are unaccustomed to that. But now, that is correct, numerous party organizations have, at long last, come to their senses because someone must tell the truth; let us put it this way: It is essential to conduct honest polices.

"All political movements and parties can have their say here. They have this opportunity in the mass media, no matter what is said about a blockade currently being in operation—it has been calculated, however, that a simultaneous volley of all mass media is six to eight times greater than what the party press can deliver, so that here, this, too is disinformation.

"Now, for the party as an organization: There is a decision of the Congress of People's Deputies, and there is a decision of the session to hold the referendum. We, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, working within the framework of the Constitution, call upon people to take part in the implementation of this opportunity of expressing one's will freely. What can be wrong with that, or what can there be in this that is not in conformity with the law?

"Let me repeat yet again: We are now working and carrying out agitation among the people because it is our duty. We will never forgive ourselves if we fail to say to people: Dear people! If we now fail to come to an awareness of the fact that we must stop in many areas, that we must indeed restructure our Union upon new principles, but in unity, for it is easier to overcome all the impediments and difficulties that exist when we are together; dear people, do understand that we are a big state. After the war we were able to keep peace in the world. It is our duty to preserve our state as a strong, large, and powerful state, and it is our duty as a party to explain this to people.

"Those who appeal otherwise—let them take the responsibility for what ensues upon themselves. But one must not get into a blind alley and urge people on to make things harsher, to feuding and clashes. So, the party is not directly setting up constituencies of its own, nor is it printing its own ballot papers, but it is acting within the framework of the Constitution, appealing to people and explaining to people that to be in the Union represents the foundation to overcome all the difficulties we have now come up against, to overcome the crisis, to have a better life and a better future for our generation."

The referendum is geared to the future, says Luchinskiy. We have the potential, the historical background, and natural resources—let us not tear it apart by our own hands, concludes Luchinskiy.

Prokofyev on Lobbying Efforts

PM1403150791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[A. Shinkin report: "Reason, Not Emotion"]

[Text] You could say that Yu.A. Prokofyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of Moscow Gorkom [City Party Committee], advanced the thought cited in our headline throughout yesterday's news conference. The theme was set by the hottest topic of the day: Moscow's Communists and the 17 March referendum.

The leader of the capital's party organization spoke about preparations for the referendum. In the light of the bitter experience of the last elections to soviets, when the gorkom and rayon party committees were essentially inactive, party workers have now actively involved themselves in propaganda work. They have produced placards and leaflets, and they are writing items in the press and speaking at meetings in labor collectives and primary party organizations to explain their position. Because the main emphasis is being put not on "bureaucratic" arrangements but on work with the specific individual. This activity by party committees is getting results.

Only in a united Union, Yu.A. Prokofyev stressed, is it possible to avoid great shocks. Because the Union's collapse now, in a period of grave crisis, would radically undermine the economy, leading to further impoverishment of the workers and tragedies for the peoples. It would also become a tragedy on an international scale, since the world equilibrium of forces would be upset.

In the opinion of the leader of the capital's Communists the current social confrontation is hindering stabilization and aggravating the economic crisis. You cannot break things up and start again all the time; you have to go forward, getting rid of old mistakes without destroying everything that has been created.

Radicals are trying to reduce the referendum to a question of support for the politics of Gorbachev or Yeltsin. But that is quite wrong, Yu.A. Prokofyev said. You cannot compare your attitude to these two politicians

with the future of the country and the people or the preservation of a state which has developed over centuries. Politicians are not everlasting, they come and go. And when taking the ballot paper let each one of us make a decision based not on our sympathies for current idols but out of love for our fatherland. It is a decision destined to stand for all time.

Nishanov on a Voluntary Union

PM1403145791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with R.N. Nishanov by unidentified correspondent under the rubric "Everyone Decides the Country's Fate"; place and date not given: "For a Renewed Union"]

[Text] [PRAVDA] Rafik Nishanovich, today there is much talk about the referendum. Points of view are very varied. Paradoxical though it may seem, however, it has turned out that many people simply do not know why the referendum is going to be held. What is the main point of it?

[Nishanov] The main point of the upcoming referendum is to give every Soviet person the possibility to establish their attitude to the USSR and say "yes" or "no" to our new home, a renewed federation of sovereign republics with equal rights, in which the rights and freedoms of individuals of every nationality will be fully guaranteed. As we can see, everybody will decide on the future of the country both individually and all together. This will also be a test of the individual's maturity.

A direct appeal to the will of the people, or a nationwide referendum, is quite rare in world practice as a form of direct democracy. Our country did not used to resort to this form at all, since it was considered that the will of the people was reflected through the representative system—soviets of people's deputies at all levels. Now when the question of whether the USSR should exist or not is being asked, we must make a decision; we must all be accountable to history, think, weigh things up, and count up all the arguments "for" and "against" uniting peoples into one federative state.

Reforming our Union is a complex and lengthy matter. The organization and holding of a USSR referendum is only one phase in the process of renewing the USSR, the need for which was determined at the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies in December 1990.

The whole complex of organizational measures and the procedure for holding a USSR referendum is determined in the USSR Law on a USSR Nationwide Vote (Referendum) adopted recently by the Congress of the country's people's deputies. Without going into detail, I will just say that all the organizational-legal bases of a USSR referendum are mainly directed at providing every USSR citizen with the opportunity to independently express his attitude to the question formulated on the ballot paper. A referendum is binding for all USSR republics and citizens. No one has the right to deprive people of the right to participate in a referendum. Therefore the USSR Supreme Soviet has repeatedly examined questions of the organization and holding of the referendum, and has proceeded and and is continuing to proceed on the basis of the fact that regardless of where they live, people must be given the opportunity to express their attitude to the question of preserving the union of republics and peoples.

We do not have any experience of holding a referendum, as I have already said; therefore, in many ways we proceed on the basis of the closeness between elections and a nationwide vote and the coincidence of many stages and procedures of holding them. It is important for the vote to be democratic, nationwide, equal, and secret and for it to proceed properly with the strictest observance of the law at all stages, including the summing up and the publication of the results of the USSR referendum.

[PRAVDA] Why is it necessary to hold a referendum right now?

[Nishanov] Primarily because a great deal has been placed in doubt today in the sphere of national relations and national-state building: the voluntary nature of unification in a Union, the equal rights of peoples, nations, and nationalities, friendship and mutual understanding, cooperation and mutual support, the results of many years of joint labor, justice and the equal nature of union relations, and so on. The most dangerous thing, however, is that our USSR has started disintegrating more intensely, separatist and openly nationalistic aspirations have taken on a threatening nature, and tendencies toward exclusiveness and detachment from the USSR are increasingly clearly visible. All this as a whole plus the difficult path of reforms and the growth in interethnic recriminations has put forward the following question: Either we find a way of creating new forms and structures for the political and economic development of the republics that constitute the USSR and their cooperation and integration, or the republics will take the line of full political and economic autonomy. But the peoples living in the USSR must provide the answer to this question. Whether to live in the Union or outside it is a vitally important question that affects the interests and future not just of those who are alive now, but also of future generations.

[PRAVDA] How will it look, our new home? What basic principles are involved in the formation of a renewed Union?

[Nishanov] Scarcely anyone will be bold enough to predict all the aspects, relationsships, architecture, and general structure of this home, the models and structures of the new union of peoples and republics. Renewal is not a one-shot act, but a lengthy process that requires brains, patience, will, and labor. Today one can only say that the first bricks are being laid in the foundations of the future house, the foundation of the new Union,

which will allow us step by step to construct qualitatively new relations between the sovereign republics, which all together will make up the new union state—the USSR. The future Union can be foreseen primarily as a single federative democratic state to which the sovereign republics will belong. As the official representatives of the vast majority of the republics agreed, seven basic principles were formulateded in the recently published draft Union Treaty, that is, conditions for unification into a Union, the most important of which are: recognizing every party to the treaty as a sovereign state, and the USSR as a sovereign federative democratic state which exercises state power within the remit it has been granted by the partiies to the treaty; recognizing the priority of human rights in accordance with universally recognized norms of international law; and molding and developing a civic society.

The system of the future Union and the procedure for republics entering and leaving it have not yet been resolved. However, there is unanimity that the future Union will have all the properties and attributes of a state organization: citizenship, territory, borders, a constitution, legislation, symbols, and so on.

Powers in the USSR can be divided into two groups: 1) those that the republics party to the treaty allocate to the USSR; and 2) those that the USSR and the republics implement together. So the Union can fully exercise its powers and perform its duties, it is being given the necessary property, and the right to impose nationwide taxes and duties, adopt laws and form Union services, including legislative, executive, judicial, and prosecutors' organizatins. As a whole, the mechanism for the implementation of the Union Treaty and its basic principles have been worked out, and it will be subsequently fleshed out in the future new USSR Constitution and other laws.

[PRAVDA] Rafik Nishanovich, it is known that not everyone supports the referendum. What will happen to the republics that do not take part in holding the USSR referendum?

[Nishanov] A refusal to hold the USSR referendum will mean that the relevant organs in the republics are pursuing the line of breaking off relations with other republics and the Union.

This question gives rise to many contradictions: Does this mean that economic relations will be preserved in their previous form? What is to happen to the regions whose people want to live within the USSR? These are complex questions, and answers to them must be sought. It is obvious that a decision to refuse to hold the referendum is not the same as a decision to leave the Union. In that event we would need to be guided by the USSR Law on the Procedure for a Republic's Withdrawal from the USSR, which expects that at least two-thirds of the USSR citizens who live on the republic's territory permanently at the time when the issue of its withdrawal from the USSR is brought up, must vote in support of the decision to withdraw.

The question that has been submitted to the USSR referendum of 17 March 1991 must not be confused with the question of whether "a republic should or should not be within the USSR." These questions have different legal foundations, and correspondingly the legal consequences cannot be the same either. If, therefore, the USSR referendum does not provide a positive answer to the question, this does not automatically mean that the republic will leave the USSR. Regardless of whether a referendum is held in a particular republic, relations with this republic will be built on the basis of observance of the current USSR Constitution and laws.

Komsomol Urges Vote for Union

LD1403083491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1532 GMT 13 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Galina Vinitskaya]

[Text] Moscow, 13 Mar (TASS)—The Komsomol Central Committee Bureau, the most popular youth organization in the Soviet Union, has called on young people, on everyone who is not indifferent to the fate of the country, to say "yes" to the USSR and by this to speak against the disintegration of the stae, the breakup of economic, political and cultural ties between the peoples, and against interethnic conflicts, separatism, nationalism, and the "war of laws." The "Political Statement" adopted by the Komsomol Central Committee in connection with the forthcoming USSR referendum reads to this effect.

The Komsomol Central Committee Bureau appeals to all civic, political and public movements to display political wisdom and foresight and to advocate the preservation of the USSR as the common historical property of all the peoples of the Soviet Union and as the reliable basis for their prosperity and progress. The Komsomol Central Committee Bureau also calls on them to advocate the renewal of the federation, the sovereignty of the republics, and the priority of human rights and freedoms.

Soyuz's Tikhonov Stresses Preserving Union

LD1403175691 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Studio interview with Georgiy Ivanovich Tikhonov, member of the presidium of the Soyuz deputies group in USSR Supreme Soviet, by Vladimir Stefanov—live or recorded]

[Text] [Stefanov] The Soyuz deputies group in the USSR Supreme Soviet has unequivocally called on fellow-countrymen to vote "yes" to the unity of our state, the Soviet Union. The appeal they have issued also says that

the Soyuz deputies group calls on all parties and sociopolitical movements and organizations to unite in opposition to forces that are trying to destroy our common home, the USSR, and pushing us towards a fratricidal civil war. Our strength is in unity, as has been the case in difficult times in the past. Georgiy Ivanovich Tikhonov is a member of the presidium of the Soyuz deputies group.

Georgiy Ivanovich, what are your main arguments, the arguments of you and your colleagues in the group, in favor of retaining a reinvigorated union?

[Tikhonov] There are very many arguments. There are economic arguments. There is also the question of defending a united state. But we decided not to dwell on these issues, because the issue is clear for everyone to see. But there is another aspect of this question. This is the social side. After all, about 70 million citizens of the union live outside their historical homeland. About 60 million of our citizens are involved in mixed marriages. This, I consider, is the most important thing that could lead to a fratricidal war if the union begins to break up. This must not be allowed to happen, not under any circumstances.

[Stefanov] Georgiy Ivanovich, I know you have visited Lithuania several times. These apprehensions of yours, have they been confirmed in any way in these republics, in Lithuania in particular?

[Tikhonov] Lithuania is perhaps the most ethnically homogenous of our republics. Only 20 percent of the inhabitants are non-Lithuanians. Nevertheless, one very frequently encounters instances of mixed marriage. I recall a meeting I had at the Lithuanian state regional electric power station. A Ukrainian woman stood on the rostrum and wept. What can I do, she cried. I am a Ukrainian and my husband is a Lithuanian. Where can I go to? I can only vote for a single union.

[Stefanov] You say that if the union breaks up, so to speak, there could be a civil war. How serious are these fears of yours?

[Tikhonov] We are not the only ones talking about this. The whole world is talking about this. During meetings we had in America with U.S. congressmen and senators, the same idea was expressed. Americans cannot understand why we are so unconcerned about this possibility. Today they are probably more in favour of the USSR's unity than many of our own citizens. From the economic point of view, it is more advantageous to have one firm partner. From the political point of view, this is also the case because, terrible as it is to contemplate, the unleasing of a civil war on our territory could lead to a world war.

[Stefanov] My last question is this, Georgiy Ivanovich. Let us assume that the referendum is over. Let us hope, so to speak, that the answer to the referendum question is a positive one. What happens next?

[Tikhonov] We are certain that the answer will be a positive one. But our Soyuz group, small as we are, is worried by the juridical aspect of this referendum, about which there is a great deal of dispute at the moment. We regard this referendum as a watershed. We consider that once this referendum is over, we must call a halt to destruction, to destructive activities by our public, strange as this might seem. We must move on into a creative period. That is the main thing.

[Stefanov] Thank you.

Komarov Atacks Union Opponents

PM1403141791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Mar 91 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Georgiy Komarov, cochairman of Soyuz, the All-Union Association of People's Deputies at All Levels, conducted by Captain 2d Rank V. Urban; date and place not indicated; first two paragraphs are biographical sketch: "The 17 March Referendum: It Will Be a crucial Day"]

[Text] From KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's file: G.A Komarov was born in 1945. He is a doctor of medical sciences and professor. Until 1989 he worked as director of the Kirghiz Scientific Research Institute for Ecology and the Prevention of Infectious Diseases.

He is USSR people's deputy for Frunzenskiy-Oktyabrskiy National-Territorial Electoral District No. 322 and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Ecology and the Rational Use of Natural Resources. In parliament he, as a rule, maintains a centrist position.

[Urban] There are many disputes now over the coming referendum. Let us therefore remind readers once again that it is the preservation of the USSR as a renewed federation of sovereign republics enjoying equal rights that is at issue. Forecasts are already being made. But what proposals does Soyuz have?

[Komarov] First, I think it should be said that preparatory work for the referendum began only after the adoption of the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution on 25 February. And so far all the forecasts are merely approximate. Why?

It is well known that a mixed attitude to the referendum obtains in many republics. Therefore, while expressing purely my own opinion rather than that of Soyuz as a whole, I would like to say that many of today's problems today really stem from a lack of clarity in the wording of the referendum question.

[Urban] But the Supreme Soviet itself confirmed it...

[Komarov] Yes, but nevertheless I do think that the main point of the wording (provided, of course, you do not proceed from a different standpoint) can be discerned perfectly simply. And what is that? It is the preservation of the Union on a renewed basis. That is

understood by everyone in general terms. Although there are movements, parties, and people today bent on demonstrating in every way possible that the wording proposed by our parliament misses precisely that—the main point. I can't agree. Everything depends on your angle of view. If you don't wear blinders, then the main idea is clear.

[Urban] The 25 February resolution mentioned by you says that the supreme organs of power of certain republics are seeking to replace the referendum and carry out republic polls instead of the all-Union vote. And you adopted almost ultimatum demands in the resolution on, for example, the immediate adoption of measures to create USSR referendum commissions in republics. What caused this, Georgiy Alekseyevich?

[Komarov] Despite the fact that the parliaments of a number of republics are now working very energetically to wreck the holding of the refendum or impose a certain point of view, Soyuz thinks that everyone should make his own choice. Ultimately people, not parties, should answer.

The point is not, say, that the Republic of Georgia should vote entirely in favor. Even that way of putting the question is wrong. Our words should be plain. Yes, a section of the population will vote against Georgia being part of the USSR. But there is another section—a no less significant section of the population—favors the preservation of the Union. And that must be recognized. Unfortunately, they are reluctant to do so in a number of republics.

[Urban] But the Georgian Supreme Soviet has nevertheless decided not to hold the USSR referendum...

[Komarov] That, I think, is an infringement of human rights. That is precisely why our resolution of 25 February grants everyone the right to express his opinion, despite the opposition even of republic organs. The expression of one's opinion is an inalienable human right, one enshrined in international legal acts and the USSR Constitution. And enshrined, incidentally, in the constitutions of all our republics without exception. I specially looked at the documents.

[Urban] Is that why the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted such strict wording, then?

[Komarov] Yes, I think so, because a certain campaign was launched and attempts were made to get people to think that the USSR referendum infringes their rights. Ideas are simply being misrepresented here. There are no legislative barriers in the country—either in the Union or the republics—to prevent people taking part in the referendum on preserving the Union.

I that is precisely why attempts are being made to replace the all-Union referendum with polls of their own in certain republics where they want impose (there's no other description) the standpoint which has arisen in the parliaments. And there the objective is perfectly clear—to avoid somehow answering the question on the preservation of the Union...

That is precisely why local soviets, enterprises, labor collectives, and public organizations in those republics are being given the right to establish electoral districts and voting places. And this right must be exercised.

[Urban] But people there will simply not be allowed to vote...

[Komarov] Not everywhere. But I am dealing with the situation as of now. Of course not everyone will take part in the referendum here on 17 March. Our opponents will therefore call the results into question. That is their business. And their mistake.

It seems to me that no one today seeks to forcibly and artificially keep a republic in the renewed federation. What should happen, in my view, is the following: If a republic can demonstrate on the basis of the referendum results that it is against the Union, let it revert to the status of the 1922 treaty. Or any other status. It does not want to be part of the new Union and therefore may exercise the Law on Secession from the USSR and execute the whole procedure in accordance with the law.

[Urban] But for the present we are talking about the referendum, about preserving the USSR...

[Komarov] Correct. The point is that the parliaments which have rejected the referendum are making a mistake... Soyuz pointed out in its program that the people can exercise their right to self-determination. That is their constitutional right. But it should proceed on a civilized basis. According to the law another referendum should be conducted, but this time on whether the the people agree to leaving the USSR or not. And everyone will then regard differently all the social and political consequences which arise for him. Everything will be different. Many republic parliaments and governments will not then enjoy support from the people.

[Urban] Why do you think that way?

[Komarov] I am sure that a considerable part of the population of the republics realizes that withdrawal from the USSR is folly. Why? There are many aspects to this. I will dwell on one. The West would like to see republics seceding more for political than economic reasons. Few people there are interested in the products we produce. The West would like to regard our republics as sources of cheap raw materials and cheap manpower. That is abundantly clear. And here the Baltic republics present the least interest to the West, because they are republics which process rather than produce raw materials.

[Urban] So let us talk again about your opponents' position. The point is that since the adoption of the 25 February resolution there has been talk about the illegality of electoral districts and voting places for the USSR referendum being established by local soviets, enterprises, labor collectives, and public organizations in

republics where referendum commissions have not been created. Could you comment on this?

[Komarov] Briefly. Is it really legal if a parliament (the legitimate authority, I would stress) does not give its voters the opportunity to exercise this very important constitutional right? So everything is normal here when any public organization campaigns to ensure that people exercise their constitutional right, particularly as the USSR Referendum Central Commission will be the main organizer of this work. This is an official state organ. Republics will not even allocate resources for holding the referendum. I think that there is no dispute here.

[Urban] The formation of referendum districts and voting places actually in military units has been authorized in those republics where central commissions have not been set up. How do you regard this?

[Komarov] It is a correct decision. In certain republics a situation has developed where the military are regarded as second-class people and where they have been deprived of their political rights. The Union parliament has therefore afforded them such an opportunity. There are no contradictions at all in members of the families of servicemen and any other citizens who do not have this opportunity in their own neighborhood going there to vote. After all, they are citizens of the USSR.

[Urban] All this is stipulated in the Union Supreme Soviet resolution. I would note in this context that many deputies oppose the document. I recall here the words uttered by Deputy N. Engver at the session: "If someone who is a USSR people's deputy campaigns against the USSR and advocates its disintegration, he should in conscience resign. And I suggest that all those who campaign against the Union resign."

[Komarov] I agree with him. Parliamentarians throughout the world have a moral code. An American senator, for example, is not allowed to behave in a manner unbecoming a senator. And if we say that we have been elected by the people and serve them, we should remember that USSR citizens are behind us. Indeed it is immoral for someone who wears a USSR people's deputy badge to call for the violation of the USSR Constitution and the splitting up of the USSR. He must resign as a deputy and then conduct himself as he deems fit.

International Aspects of Referendum Analyzed

LD1403171491 Moscow TASS in English 1654 GMT 14 Mar 91

[By TASS political analyst Sergey Kolesnikov]

[Text] Moscow March 14 TASS—Politicians and the public in many countries are closely watching preparations for the Soviet referendum on the future of the union. And for a good reason: They understand that the world's future depends to a considerable degree on whether or not the Soviet Union will remain one of the world's great powers, one of the pillars of the existing world order.

It is clear that the disappearance of the Soviet Union from the world map would be equivalent to a tectonic shift in international affairs and result in the disruption of the world's political and strategic balance.

The withdrawal of the Soviet Union from the stage would interrupt the current movement towards a better-ordered world. More than that, it could provoke the undesirable struggle for the Soviet legacy, involving many forces. At key moments in world history Russia and then the Soviet Union acted as a stabilizing force in world politics. At present, at a transitional stage in the historical development, this stabilizing force is extremely important, especially taking into account the Soviet Union's geopolitical situation at the juncture of several differently oriented political forces. This fact was born out again during the recent conflict around the Persian Gulf. It is clear, however, that a stabilizing role can only be played by a unified alliance, not one of its parts.

Another geopolitical point is that the Soviet Union is one of the two major world powers possessing the greatest military, including nuclear potential built into international relations based on treaties that envisage its limitation and reduction on a mutual basis. What will happen to these agreements and treaties if the Soviet Union ceases to exist? The disarmament process may be reversed and reduced to nothing.

The division of Soviet military potential among republics will certainly lead to unpredictable consequences. With nationalist passions on the boil in the country, it is impossible to rule out the possibility of a civil war in which clashes may occur over the redrafting of the borders and the possession of natural resources and of shares of the country's nuclear, missile and chemical potential. The very thought of what consequences this is likely to bring to the country is appalling. In the present inter-related world, such a turn of events would not only provoke economic and political upheavals around the globe, but would directly involve other countries and put on the agenda territorial disputes which appeared to have been solved.

The search for a new model of a community of people within the framework of a multinational state - a major aspect of the Soviet Union's transformation into a real federation of sovereign republics - should not be underestimated either. This search, experience has shown, is of international value.

There are also more prosaic reasons for the West's apprehension with regard to the disintegration of the Soviet Union. For instance, inter-ethnic conflicts have already caused intensive mass migration both within the

country's borders and across them. Further intensification of these processes would spark off a mass exodus which would then threaten much greater economic instability.

The disintegration of the Soviet Union would also exacerbate ecological problems. Moreover, if the Soviet Union's arsenal of chemical plants, nuclear power stations and other enterprises of this kind are no longer subject to the single controlling centre, mounting tensions could probably lead to the failure of any preventive devices and hence pose a major threat of new Chernobyl-like nuclear or chemical disasters entailing sinister global consequences.

The current propaganda campaign around the renewal of the Soviet Union, which is being stirred up by certain forces in the West, is reminiscent of cold war ploys. A new aspect in the old game is what organisers of such campaigns could hardly count on earlier - the presence of organised political opposition within the Soviet Union. Tough guys in the West appeal to this opposition or refer. But appeals to intolerance and prodding destructive forces to action look rather outdated under present conditions for a simple reason that they run counter to the interests of western countries themselves.

Constructive Approach Required To End Crisis

PM1503111191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Mar 91 p 1

[Article by legal affairs commentator Leonid Nikitinskiy: "No Room for Two Bolivars... Do We Need a New 'New Type' Party?"]

[Text] By midday on Sunday the whole of Manege Square and all the streets and alleys adjoining it were tightly packed with people. When, at just after 1300 hours, Telman Gdlyan announced over the microphone that a new People's Party of Russia was being set up and asked for those present to vote in favor, the whole square turned pink from raised palms, as if another new dawn of some kind had broken over the sea of people. I waited for Telman Khorevich to ask for the sake of politeness who was opposed, and raised a lone hand. As far as the eye could see no one joined me.

It was the first time in my life that I had been to a rally, because I believed, and still do, that issues that are at all serious cannot be resolved in this manner. A rally can express the public mood in a thunderous roar, it can raise up a tribune, set up or cast down an idol—in this sense it is proper and useful; but it is not capable of producing any clear, constructive program.

Anyway, I have little confidence in direct democracy; I believe, in spite of everything, in representative democracy with parliament being the fruit and expression. So what devil was it that drove me to Manege Square? Very simply: Having previously frequently attended the nearby Supreme Soviet, I began to incline toward the opinion that it too, in its present position, is completely sterile. All its exertions are in vain, because they are no longer fueled by the people's energy, burning up uselessly on the streets or in kitchens.

However, remember what euphoria gripped us during the election of USSR people's deputies, how ecstatic we were over the televised relays of their first congress. It is hard to believe that this was only two years ago. And now hundreds of thousands of voices in formation in Manege Square are chanting: "Re-sign! Re-sign!" They are echoed by a chorus from other squares around the country. No, they are not "extremists." They are the people, or at least a section of it. Only a blind man could fail to see this, fail to see the wood for the trees.

But what was it that broke the umbilical cord without which the people are a crowd deprived of an articulate voice, and the deputies are like radio receivers on the wrong wavelength but whose batteries continue to run remorselessly? Who trod on the hose allowing life-giving air from the square to reach the chambers of parliament?

The whole system of the soviets, from top to bottom, is like a car with its engine running but not moving, its wheels spinning so hard they are making smoke. But for all that—whether it is good or bad, economical or ruinously expensive—it can still be reckoned as a parliamentary system provided that it fulfills all that the current Constitution prescribes. What then is wrong with it? This: Alongside the parliament (the soviets), there exists in the country an extremely powerful, very rich political organization, one that is very old by Soviet standards and which operates not only and not so much through parliamentary methods. The parliamentary and the nonparliamentary powers-that-be are trying to find some kind of parity, not understanding that compromise here is impossible in principle. One of them, undoubtedly, is superfluous.

Therefore the call to create a new party, to assign a rigid party structure to the free democratic movement, which was heard so clearly for the first time at Sunday's rally, is no accident. But to what end, if new parties already exist? And, what is more, if they are headed by many of the very people who spoke at the rally?

The former social democratic and other parties were created as parties having as their main aim to legally and lawfully amass votes from the electorate within the framework of a civilized political battle and ensure the coordination of the actions of deputies retaining their own personal opinions. There has not hitherto been any talk of "directives," of iron party discipline, of the unconditional subordination of the minority to the majority, let alone the creation of "cells" (what a familiar little word!) based on place of work or service.

Now, however, the talk is of forming a party of a completely different, or I should say, Bolshevik type: one capable of opposing the CPSU. This is, generally speaking, a natural response to the actions of the latter, because the CPSU, all the signs suggest, has no intention

of joining the ranks of parliamentary parties—in practice, not words—and some Communists in the republics are operating by nonparliamentary, not to say anticonstitutional, methods in everything.

It is perfectly clear that all the parliamentary parties and democratic currents put together cannot compete today with the CPSU in an equal weight category. This is nothing like political pluralism. This is the same old political monopoly. Nevertheless, I vote against the formation of another party in the image and likeness of the CPSU—only (today, at least) with the opposite sign.

The question here is not that I personally have never belonged to any party, and do not intend to do so. I am altogether against any parties employing anything other than parliamentary methods. This is a country wishing to class itself as civilized. Yet its primitive shoulders, more accustomed to the weight of the rifle, is now being measured for the respectable, civilian suit worn by a rule-of-law state. The activity of nonparliamentary parties is outside the framework of the Constitution.

I understand that only someone who is even stronger can push a strong man from his path—this is how the democrats reason in talking of setting up a "new type" party. But in setting up such a party, they by their own hand deprive themselves of the lofty title of democrats. It will be set up not for the sake of peace and creativity, but for overthrowing and fighting. This is a party—a "combat detachment"—with the sole task of shoving its political rival from its path. An understandable aim, perhaps, but the methods are very much guilty of imitativeness...

The ends never ever justify the means, a lesson history has taught us many times, because the outcome is always the consequence of the means themselves, and never of the ends. It is perfectly possible, even—if everything develops according to the scenario that has been dreamed up—that in the end the young cub will manage to oust the old war-horse standing in his way. But, who knows, will he not be subsequently tempted to himself to block the way to someone who comes along later? No, this fight will not strengthen our feeble parliamentary democracy, but meanwhile a lot of blood could be spilt.

What is the conclusion? Yes, there is a conclusion: To act strictly in accordance with the Constitution, Article 6 that now, as is well known, sounds somewhat different today than before. Parliament itself might, not waiting for the inevitable and terrible battle between the titans, forbid any nonparliamentary, nonconstitutional, and essentially illegal actions by any political parties. Those compromised by such actions, now or in the future, should be disbanded by lawful means.

And then everyone will have plenty of air, including parliament, whose motor will begin to operate as it is supposed to. And there will be normal representative democracy and normal authority.

Republics Question Referendum's Validity

PM0503154291

[Editorial Report] Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 February 1991 carries on page 4 of its First Edition a column under the rubric "Who Is Opposed," comprising an appeal from the Interregional Deputies Group to USSR Supreme Soviet members, plus a commentary by Candidate of Legal Sciences R. Aleksandrov.

The text of the appeal, headed "On the Attitude to the All-Union Referendum," reads as follows:

"The decision to hold a USSR referendum has prompted varied reactions in Armenia, Georgia, Moldova, the Ukraine, the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, and the Baltic republics.

"The referendum question is worded so as to incorporate several heterogeneous questions. As a result of this, there can be no simple interpretation of a positive or negative response to the referendum.

"The USSR Congress and Supreme Soviet resolution on the referendum, like the adopted wording of the question, contravenes the USSR Law on the Referendum, according to which no question pertaining to a republic's competence or change of status can be put to the referendum. The mechanism for assessing the results in terms of the USSR as a whole violates the peoples' inalienable right to self-determination.

"The Interregional Deputies' Group proposes:

"1. That preparations for the referendum be suspended, and that the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee be commissioned to bring the proposed wording and the referendum procedures into line with existing USSR legislation.

"2. That it be considered expedient to hold republic referendums for approving the draft Union Treaty once it has been agreed by the authorized representatives of the republics.

"Adopted at a general meeting of the Interregional Deputies' Group.

"17 February 1991.

"Please distribute among members of the USSR Supreme Soviet."

There follows an "editorial note": "The statement was signed by the following USSR People's Deputies: O. Kalugin, G. Starovoytova, A. Yablokov, V. Chelyshev, G. Novikov, L. Valentinov, A. Kazannik, S. Seleznev, S. Boykov, S. Ryabchenko, A. Yastrebov, and others."

This is followed by R. Aleksandrov's 800-word article, headed "If Only They Could Find a Loophole," dismissing the above on two counts. First, on political grounds: Aleksandrov finds it hardly surprising that reaction to the referendum should be so varied given the

complex atmosphere created by "pluralists" who are seeking to implement their own "megalomanic schemes," and desire the "collapse of the USSR" so that they themselves might get a better grip on power.

Second, on juridical grounds: Aleksandrov quotes Article 5 of the Constitution and clarifies the actual wording of the USSR Law on the Referendum, arguing that the Congress and Supreme Soviet resolutions "fully comply with the USSR Constitution." He concludes by calling for the creation of "an atmosphere in which the first referendum would be a genuinely free and responsible expression of the will of all the country's peoples."

KGB Directorate Chief on Economic Protection

PM1403165191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

["Interview at Readers' Request" under the rubric "Top Secret" with Lieutenant General N. A. Savenkov, chief of the USSR KGB 6th Directorate, by correspondents Yu. Makhrin and A. Chernyak; place and date not given: "Is the Protection Secure?"]

[Text] "Protection Against Sabotage"—this was the title of a report from the KGB operational headquarters published in PRAVDA 19 December last year. It was about the chekists' first steps to implement USSR Supreme Soviet instructions. The fact that it entrusted this work to the state security organs gave rise to mixed feelings and opinions among readers. The letters contained many questions. The PRAVDA correspondents decided to put them to Lieutenant General N.A. Savenkov, chief of the USSR KGB 6th Directorate.

[PRAVDA] Nikolay Andreyevich, it is more than two months since an operational headquarters to combat economic sabotage was set up on the basis of the 6th Directorate. Many readers are wondering how the fight is proceeding.

[Savenkov] We are not waging the struggle alone. We are working in conjunction with the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry, the USSR Prosecutor's Office, and organs of Soviet power, state management and worker's control. We are acting more as administrative organs, promptly informing the country's leadership, interested ministries and departments, and specific officials and the media about urgent problems and crisis phenomena in industry and in the consumer market. Since November 1990 components of KGB organs have been actively collaborating with militia and prosecutor's office organs to detect and stop offenses in the economic sphere. During that period several hundred criminal actions have been instituted. Most of them are associated with gross breaches of trading rules; there is also a large number of thefts of property and a number of cases of smuggling of nonferrous metals, raw materials, and other valuables. Consumer goods, foodstuffs, and medicines worth 320 million rubles [R], which were being hoarded for sale at speculative prices, have been discovered and sent for sale to the population.

[PRAVDA] Muscovite P. Volin observes that it is the KGB's job to catch spies, not to look for muskrat fur hats or cans of stewed meat hoarded by a store director...

[Savenkov] I see what your reader means. The point is that in the first weeks and months our headquarters was in operation there were frequent reports in the press about instances of breaches of storage, transportation, and trade procedures pertaining to food and consumer goods. So people got the impression that it was a blatant manifestation of sabotage in the economic sphere. But, in fact, none of these offenses could be described as "economic sabotage." Even in cases where criminal action was taken it was done by law-enforcement bodies, including the KGB, where there was evidence of crimes against socialist property, economic crimes, or abuse of office.

We state security organ personnel operate solely on the basis of and within the framework of the law, so we cannot describe particular criminal actions as sabotage if that crime does not figure in criminal legislation.

[PRAVDA] The "Protection Against Sabotage" report said that the USSR KGB 6th Directorate was set up to tackle a range of counterintelligence tasks connected with organizing efforts to counter the intelligence and subversive activities of foreign special services against defense industry, national economic, and scientific facilities. For instance, readers V. Naumov in Ulyanovsk and N. Andreyev in Stavropol ask: Is the fight against economic sabotage obscuring the chekists' implementation of tasks that are important in terms of safeguarding state security?

[Savenkov] It did happen initially. What caused it was the unexpected and unorthodox nature of the instructions we received. It took time and extra effort to evaluate the situation and analyze the entire system of our activities again, taking the new data into account, and make the requisite adjustments to its organizational structure.

[PRAVDA] What is the nature of this system? If it is not a secret, of course.

[Savenkov] Our directorate's system of activities is counterintelligence work in several interrelated areas. First and foremost countering foreign special services' intelligence activities, mainly using agents. Identifying and stopping attempts by individual Soviet citizens to establish contact with members of foreign special services to hand over secret information. Participating in ensuring the security of state, commercial, and other secrets, assisting the leaders of defense or other departments or facilities in the implementation of measures to guard against foreign technical surveillance...

[PRAVDA] But what about the letters from people who are worried about how safe state secrets are in conditions of glasnost and "unbounded" democracy?

[Savenkov] We pay special attention to reviewing the existing normatives relating to the protection of state

secrets. Our committee has worked with other organizations to prepare a draft USSR Law "On the Protection of Secret Information in the USSR" and draft methods for deciding what information constitutes a state secret. Proposals were also prepared on devising a system for the protection of information constituting a "commercial secret." They were reflected in the USSR Law "On USSR Enterprises."

But I must express concern in connection with the growing trend of unwarranted "openness" on the part of certain officials in relations with foreign firms. Often Soviet expertise, leading scientific achievements, and the latest industrial and other developments are given to foreign representatives "for free." No way does this contribute to the acceleration of the country's scientific-technical progress; in fact, it can do direct and indirect harm to the Soviet economy.

Are you not getting tired of my secrets?

[PRAVDA] No.

[Savenkov] Then I will continue. It is also our job to frustrate and localize subversive actions to harm the USSR economy, involving the exploitation by special services (or by firms commissioned by them) of the new conditions and forms of foreign economic activity, including joint ventures, commercial and banking transactions on the foreign market, and also bribery of Soviet officials to induce them to create conditions for the contract supply of substandard imports and the use of Soviet territory to try out ecologically dangerous biological and chemical preparations and technologies.

On 7 February the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Court completed its examination of the criminal case against V. Fomichev, former chief engineer at the USSR Radio Industry Ministry Scientific Research Center for Computer Technology, who accepted a bribe of R30,416 from representatives of two foreign firms. Taking advantage of his official position and receiving so-called souvenirs and gifts, Fomichev provided the foreigners with certain preferential terms, which ultimately caused considerable material and other damage to the Soviet side. The evidence that was assembled in the case completely confirmed Fomichev's guilt and he was sentenced by the court to four years in jail.

So in view of the unremitting activity of Western intelligence services, we are carrying out a wide range of counterintelligence and other measures.

[PRAVDA] In short, the Cheka does not slumber. But now another question. You mentioned the unremitting activity of Western intelligence services. What information do you have to support this?

[Savenkov] Despite the considerable warming of the international climate, the USSR's military and industrial potential is still a priority subject of intelligence interest for the Western special services.

The intelligence organs of the United States and other NATO countries are continuing to use their agents to collect information both about the USSR defense complex (nuclear missile arms, SDI countermeasures, mobilization readiness, civil defense) and about the situation regarding state management of finances, industrial production in the country, and difficulties in the implementation of radical economic reform. This is indicated, for instance, by the twofold increase in CIA appropriations for intelligence work involving agents against the USSR in the 1990-1991 fiscal year. And CIA Director W. Webster recently stated frankly: "The need for the United States to continue intelligence operations is of decisive importance in this period of change in the Soviet Union." The KGB is therefore forced to take the necessary countermeasures: As you know, a few years ago there were criminal proceedings for espionage against Tolkachev and others, and in 1990 once again several dangerous agents of the CIA and other foreign intelligence services were unmasked. The counterintelligence people were able to nip their operations in the bud and avert damage to the country's security. In particular, Major Kutsenko, former staffer at a Defense Ministry research institute, and Khobta, a former servicemen in the special-purpose units, were sentenced to terms of imprisonment for trying to pass secret information to the NATO countries' special services.

There has recently been a further heightening of interest in the conversion process and the resulting redistribution of manpower and material resources, in conventional types of arms, and in the creation of new tank, aircraft, and naval equipment and artillery systems and the modernization of existing types.

Here the special services actively exploit in their own interests the openness of the Soviet economy and the new forms of international cooperation, including foreign inspections to verify the fulfillment of disarmament accords and other "legal" opportunities. They engage in direct contacts with individuals who harbor an intention to emigrate and with citizens of a nationalist and extremist inclination. This frontal "work with people" with the aim of collecting intelligence information is combined with the intensive utilization of the most up-to-date technical intelligence-gathering resources and is supplemented by the recruiting of agents from among those Soviet citizens who are "suitable" for carrying out subversive and intelligence operations.

[PRAVDA] Some readers sent us a cutting from this year's first issue of NOVOYE VREMYA magazine. In the article "Sabotage?" they have underlined the following lines: "The state of the country's economy does indeed form the basis of its security, but when state security starts getting involved in the economy, this in itself becomes a danger to the state. You can't boost the economy by KGB methods..." How would you comment on that?

[Savenkov] First, there are no so-called "KGB methods" in our arsenal, and it is quite true that you can't boost the

economy by such methods. Second. It is true that many economic problems are not, strictly speaking, the state security organs' problems, but a certain proportion of them are directly associated with ensuring our state's security. That being so, the state security organs (in particular intelligence and counterintelligence, but often also the investigative subunits) make a substantial contribution to the prevention or alleviation of the negative consequences of such problems. By virtue of their professional specialization and using the operational forces, resources, and methods available to them, they can help interested state structures to resolve economic problems. Thus the main task of counterintelligence, which I represent, is to discover in good time and prevent subversive and intelligence acts and other criminal encroachments on the economic foundations of the state, while that of the investigative service is to investigate and provide documentary confirmation of such encroachments, with the support of the law.

The direct material contribution of counterintelligence workers, according to the official findings of departments and organizations, not infrequently runs to tens or even hundreds of millions of rubles.

[PRAVDA] Readers who approve of the chekists' activity, including their activity in combating economic sabotage, ask: When will the KGB finally come within the law, because since the abolition of the USSR Council of Ministers not a single document remains to regulate its work?

[Savenkov] A draft law has been drawn up and is at the stage of examination by the deputies.

Sobchak, Golik on KGB Draft Law Provisions

91UF0549A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 10, 13 Mar 91 p 3

[Commentary by Anatoliy Sobchak, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Yuriy Golik, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Law and Order and the Fight Against Crime, recorded by A. Gasparyan: "The KGB: On the Path Towards Law"]

[Text]**The draft Law on Organs of State Security in the USSR has been approved in the first reading.**

Anatoliy Sobchak, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet: It would be good if the law reflected the depoliticization of state security organs. But not in the sense that a KGB employee cannot be a member of some party or organization. The system must not contain any party or political structures and must not finance any party or political organizations or movements whatsoever.

Second—on human rights guarantees. Unfortunately, nothing about this is mentioned in the draft law that was presented. I think that in the process of finalizing the law—and there is a unified view here in the Committee on Legislation—the law must emphasize guarantees of individual rights and must designate responsibility of state security organs for violations of human rights.

The draft law is too abstract at present.

Yuriy Golik,chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Law and Order and the Fight Against Crime: The most important thing is that until now there has not been a single normative document open to public dissemination that would regulate the activity of organs of the Committee for State Security, if we disregard the initial years of Soviet power.

I think this law will allow us to resolve several questions straightaway. First of all, it will substantively refine and perfect legislative regulation of KGB activity. Second, it will place this activity under the supervision of third persons, i.e., of citizens, of the mass media, of social organizations and movements. Third, it will permit us to sweep aside all the conjecture that presently surrounds the KGB.

Not a single state in the world since the time of its birth, be it Urartu or ancient Rome, has done without organs providing for state security—engaging in intelligence, counterintelligence, border services... We can argue over whether it is good or bad for a department such as the KGB to encompass everything within its purview—from defending borders to intelligence and even—as the body of deputies might see fit—the struggle against certain varieties of crime. Possibly it is not entirely normal for one organ to be endowed with missions so diverse in nature, and we might have to find some way to gradually change the situation. I do not believe that here we should blindly copy the experience of others. Every state undergoes development according to its own laws, and we can only transpose this experience to fit our own circumstances. In discussing the draft law, some people allude to the United States, where one body is engaged in intelligence, another in counterintelligence, etc. Indeed it is this way. But a rich country can indulge itself such things. For example, organizational units engaged in the fight against drugs are found within the office of the president, in the Senate, and in the Congress. But this ends up with competition taking place among these units. If this competition develops into a struggle over funding, then everything overflows into another war—a war of laws, a war of parliaments, a war of sovereignty, a war of God knows what else...

MOSCOW NEWS Editor on Domestic Issues

91UN0998A Madrid EL PAIS in Spanish 23 Feb 91 p 15

[Interview with Deputy Yegor Yakovlev, editor of MOSCOW NEWS, by Angel A. Hernandez; place and date not given—first two paragraphs are EL PAIS introduction]

[Text] Madrid—Yegor Yakovlev, 61, is the editor of MOSCOW NEWS, the first publication to emerge with the start of glasnost (openness) and perestroyka. He is a

deputy in the USSR's Supreme Soviet. He was a member of the CPSU from 1953 until a few days ago. He left the party after the violent military repression in Vilnius, the capital of the Baltic Republic of Lithuania, in which the Kremlin attempted to suppress nationalist movements both in Lithuania and in other republics of the Soviet Union. He is now engaged in a resolute effort to promote a democratic society that will enable his country to emerge from political and economic chaos, and his fellow citizens to regain hope.

Yegor Yakovlev is still not familiar with western concepts such as liberal, conservative, or progressive. "Rather than relying on political labels, I am guided by common sense, as are many intellectuals in my country." Leaving the old system behind was traumatic for many people, and Yakovlev confesses: "I learned about political life when I was 55 years old."

[Hernandez] Was it hard for you to leave the CPSU?

[Yakovlev] No. The CPSU is moving against the forces of reform. It was actually the party that called in the army to use violence in Vilnius. I cannot be a part of such tactics. The majority of the party's members are leaving, and the party has fallen into the hands of a new group of people. It does not make sense to think that the party will have a new rebirth.

[Hernandez] What type of people?

[Yakovlev] They are people about 50 years old, resentful people who would have liked to be where they are now a long time ago. They are a generation removed from the first members of the 'apparat.' Their goal is to recover the power that the older generation lost. They want to regain control.

[Hernandez] So that they can put an end to perestroyka?

[Yakovlev] The word 'perestroyka' needs to disappear. perestroyka is a concept that existed in 1985. Later events have demonstrated that there is nothing to rebuild or renew. We have to create something new. That is the root of the basic conflict with the people who started perestroyka. Former Minister Ryzhkov complains that perestroyka has gone too far, as does Gorbachev. Gorbachev recognizes that it has gone beyond him; he is trying to slow it down so that it will not exceed the limits they they had set.

The Example to Follow

[Hernandez] So, not democracy in the Western style...?

[Yakovlev] I do not believe that is the example that we should follow. We are a Eurasian nation, and we have our own idiosyncracies. Today, the team that Gorbachev started with does not exist any more. They have all gone. However, life does not revolve only around Gorbachev. As the initiator of the reform process, he has absolutely been left behind. The fact that he has not been able to rally support in the insufficiently organized democratic forces has slowed him down.

Gorbachev is the leading shock force against the reactionary forces. After much debate, the democratic forces have come to the conclusion that unity is necessary. I believe that we are witnessing the formation of a new party, under the possible leadership of Gavril Popov, the mayor of Moscow. The last few years in the USSR have been a sort of slippery slope, with everyone skidding. Neither the democrats, the conservatives, the military, nor the members of the party's 'apparat' have been strong enough to change the course. It is very tragic, but that's the way it is.

[Hernandez] And in this situation, where does MOSCOW NEWS stand?

[Yakovlev] MOSCOW NEWS was the first democratic publication to come out. Now that there are many periodicals, we have a lot of competition. Still, even now, we publish 2.2 million copies, and there are many intellectuals among our readers. We try to be an independent periodical and shed some light on a confused situation. A democratic society is our goal. We depend on sales and advertising for our financing.

The Foundation of Democracy

[Hernandez] Is there repression of freedom of expression?

[Yakovlev] Glasnost is the foundation for all democratic principles. Putting an end to glasnost would mean putting an end to all democratic laws. That could only happen with a coup d'etat. In that case, the loss of freedom of expression would not be our greatest loss.

[Hernandez] Is a coup possible?

[Yakovlev] Anything is possible.

[Hernandez] What problems does the Soviet press face?

[Yakovlev] We have technical problems. All publications, including ours, are printed in the CPSU print shops, and that creates some limitations. We have rubles to set up our own printing plant, but the difficulty lies in converting these rubles into foreign currency. If we cannot do that, it is impossible to have our own technology and independence.

[Hernandez] That may be related to the serious economic situation....

[Yakovlev] There is no economy in the USSR. There have been economic programs, but right now there is nothing. The old regime has collapsed, and the change to a new generation is taking too long. Production is at rock bottom. The people who are now becoming land owners do not have access to a tractor to cultivate their land. The reactionary forces are trying to keep the system from working. The latest decrees from the president of the USSR have not exactly been in favor of economic development. The situation has to get even worse before conditions will be ripe for change. The new system demands the death of the old regime, and this old regime

is still in the process of decay. During the first phase of perestroyka, it seemed that this regime could be abolished. Now we see that it cannot. We have some very serious decisions to make. The people are very tired.

Yanayev Delivers Gorbachev Note to Composers

LD1403144591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1400 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Participants in the Eighth All-Union Congress of Composers continued its work in Moscow today and unanimously concluded that the creative union should exist. At the same time, they think that its old structure is inefficient and requires radical changes. The congress proclaimed a two-year transition period to the new structure. A coordination council has been set up and charged with working it out.

Yanayev, USSR vice president, made a speech at the congress. He conveyed to the delegates good wishes from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, who requested that it be conveyed to them that only the fact that he was extremely busy prevented him from taking part in the work of the forum. The president stressed that in spite of all the difficulties, the state will firmly take the side of the artist and defend talent.

Economic

Reports Note Kuzbass Coal Mine Strike Worsens

One-Third of Mines 'Not Functioning'

LD1503104791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0507 GMT 15 Mar 91

[Excerpt] [announcer] The situation remains complex in Kuzbass. As you probably know, the miners of the coal basin have gone on a political strike. They were planning to end the strike after one day, but some of the enterprises were still on strike even after several days. And now we have on the line to the Mayak "Panorama" program Vladimir Yuryev, our corrspondent in Kuzbass. Greetings, Vladimir.

[Yuryev] Good day.

[Announcer] What is the latest news?

[Yuryev] The latest news? I received it a few minutes ago from the oblast workers' committee—so it is really the latest news: The strike is continuing and, unfortunately, more and more enterprises are beginning to take part in the strike.

The information is as follows: 31 enterprises of the coal industry have stopped working. All in all there are more than 100 mines and open collieries in Kuzbass. Well, you see, some enterprises are discussing whether to go on strike or not. Shift meetings are taking place at this very moment. Some halt striking, others go on strike again, but the fact is that one-third of the enterprises are not functioning. The demands of those on strike—we are speaking of a political strike—remain the same: The main demand is the resignation of the president of the country and the Union bodies of power, and the temporary transition of the functions of the government of the country to the Federation Council.

Some mines have put forward additional demands, such as the elimination of the institution of the presidency in its present form and the dissolving of the Congress of People's Deputies. Generally speaking, all the demands that are put forward are in the same political key. Well, this is the latest and worrying information. [passage omitted]

Stocks Run Low in Kemerovo Oblast

LD1503103191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 0700 GMT 15 Mar 91

[Text] As was stated at an emergency session of the Kemerovo Oblast Soviet by (Amantuleyev), its chairman, the situation in the Kuzbass is heating up by the day. Stocks of food, including flour, are running out. Deputies are particularly worried by the miners' unending political strike and the constant threat that it will escalate into an all-Kuzbass political stoppage. Owing to hasty preparation, the results of the oblast soviet session proved unsatisfactory. Of four draft decisions on the political situation, not a single one was adopted, and a radical proposal for the oblast soviet to assume complete power throughout the Kuzbass as a component of the federation was a few votes short of being passed. To ensure food supplies to the oblast, it was decided to transfer 10 percent of output produced on the territory of the Kuzbass to an oblast fund in order to obtain food by barter with other oblasts.

A TASS correspondent reports that political demands have been added to the economic demands of miners in the Donbass, who have already been on strike for two weeks.

There was a rally in Donetsk on Thursday at which a working commission was set up. On the same day, the commission set off for Kiev for talks with the republic's government.

Donbass Committee Leaves for Kiev

LD1403195491 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1900 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Political demands have been added to the economic demands of the Donbass coal miners, who have been on strike for a fortnight now. A working committee of strikers has been set up at a rally in Donetsk. It left today for Kiev for talks with the Ukraine government.

27 Mines Strike; Yeltsin on Sideline

LD1403194891 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1900 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] The number of coal mines on strike in the Kuzbass has increased. Miners have fully halted coal extraction at 17 mines and partially at 10 others. They include the Raspadskaya mine, on which the work of the West Siberian metallurgical combine depends to a great extent. The Altay coking and chemical works in on the verge of coming to a stop. The whole town of Norilsk could remain without heat.

An emergency session of the Kemerovo Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies has been convened. Tuleyev, the soviet's chairman, announced that he has appealed to Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin to halt the strike. However, the latter has said in reply that it is a matter for the miners themselves. Those calling for a strike, the chairman of the oblast soviet said, are making the Kuzbass a hostage of the political struggle.

March Economic Trends Viewed

PM1403161091 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 9, 3-10 Mar 91 p 6

[Article by Leonid Valdman, laboratory head, International Centre for Research into Economic Reforms: "Not Yet Hitting the Bottom"]

[Text] Short-term forecasting in our economy is beginning to look like predicting the outcome of a game of chance. Nevertheless, the February economic forecast made by Grigoriy Yavlinskiy has basically come true—much to our mutual regret. As to the situation in March, a new factor will be added to those already in operation—the expected reform of retail prices.

Commodities. If one accepts the government's claims that the proposed compensations will safeguard the population against the increase in prices, the situation on the consumer market will not change markedly: supply-side inflation will be accompanied by a corresponding growth in effective demand, meaning that commodities will not return to the shelves. If, however, the compensation proves to be incomplete, the gap between demand and supply will really shrink. The whole question is, however, whether real supply will grow and to what extent.

The jump in state prices will not ensure either instantaneous equilibrium or the restoration of economic ties. There will be a new mass of money unprovided for by commodities and issued by way of preemptive compensation. Money will even more actively be "hunting" for commodities. Where are they to be found? Most likely, in the "30 per cent" of the market, where prices are freed, and on the black market into which commodities with fixed state prices will inevitably flow.

The situation on the food market is determined by the fact that, thanks to lavish gifts from the government and deputies, the countryside has lost all incentive to sell foodstuffs. Now it exchanges them. This situation is normal for a structural crisis: at first, financial resources flow over into the weakest (agrarian) sector, then material resources (by way of barter), and soon we shall probably witness what we have never seen before: manpower resources will also start moving over into the countryside. But so far it is only possible to expect a growth in prices on the collective farm markets and the authorities' pressure—now with a stick and now with a carrot—on agricultural producers.

Money circulation. Since the government has vowed that it doesn't plan any continuation of the exchange of banknotes, its vigorous actions will most likely shift into the sphere of cashless circulation. Nobody knows what technology it will use to carry out a new operation, but it would be simple to act against current accounts. If things are overdone with confiscating money and someone is reduced to the point of ruin, there is no need to worry. A stabilization fund, uncontrolled by parliament, will be set up specially for this purpose—to give alms to the weakest state enterprises. And God will care for those not run by the state. It will be much the same with the population's savings. In savings banks, depositors can add to their accounts, but cannot withdraw this money in the near future. And the state has no obligations whatsoever to those who keep their money at home, behind their icon.

The enterprises have already been misled and baffled and no longer know what to expect. Soon when the permissible size of the consumption fund has been changed, the income tax scale revised, cashless transactions limited, and perhaps other taxes changed, the producers will completely lose their bearings. Should they boost production, build up profits, invest, and if so, where?..

Budget. The January negotiations on the budget will have to be repeated if the Centre loses out in the budget war. It is impossible to make a proper estimation of all the effects of a full-scale price reform with compensation and subsequent indexation. Taxation policy and the distribution of tax revenues will have to be reviewed. In all probability, the government will be able to persuade both the President and the Supreme Soviet of the need in such an emergency situation to restore the old budgetary principles, making it possible to "consolidate" the whole state budget, i.e., to deprive republican budgets of their independence. It is unlikely, however, that the government will persuade the Council of the Federation to do this. If it fails then the intermediate variants must be considered. Either the Centre appropriates part of the Republics' revenues into the centralized fund of redistribution, or the Republics will ostensibly retain financial independence but, in fact, be compelled to spend their budgetary resources on instructions from the centre as part of a coordinated fiscal policy. But even if it does win the budgetary war, in the next few months it will see that

this is only a Pyrrhic victory. In the present situation whosoever shall "take up" the budget "shall perish by the budget".

External economic sphere. The Prime Minister's policy and his statement about "financial warfare" will merely add to the doubts of our potential partners and investors, undermining our previous attempts to attract resources from abroad. But we have to apply "there" both now and in future: for food, for commodities, for equipment needed in various areas of production, for rescheduling of debts. The threat of strikes by oil workers and miners, the fall in world oil prices, and the anti-export measure requiring exporters to give 40 per cent of their hard currency revenues to the state (regardless of hard currency expenses) will aggravate our foreign economic situation in March.

Sectors. It looks as if the land reform will not materialize even in March. Both the President's decree and Russia's laws are documents with a great future, so to speak. Special gardens and orchards for city people and special ones for rural inhabitants. What remains is to wait for famine, and then refugees from "foodless [quotation mark as received] cities will themselves begin implementing a land reform.

In the primary sectors March is the month for planned strikes. The government has no room to manoeuvre: not to accept strike committees' demands will mean to aggravate the energy crisis, to accept them will add to the developing hyperinflation.

The recession in industry will worsen, though it may be covered up by false reporting. The defence industry will continue being "rocked", despite relief from the stabilization fund. Mounting inflation will depreciate the investments earmarked for conversion. Skewed prices will further encourage barter which the defence industry cannot take advantage of (guns cannot be exchanged for butter). Profitable civilian enterprises will end up having to subsidize all the other sectors.

On the whole, the economy is steadily heading towards the lowest point of the crisis.

The latest forecast: all things considered, we shall still be far short of the bottom in March.

Agriculture

Cabinet of Ministers Meets on Spring Work

Chernoivanov Interviewed

LD1403210891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Report by correspondent V. Stepanyuk including interview with Vyacheslav Ivanovich Chernoivanov, USSR minister of agriculture; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Anouncer] Today the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, together with the leaders of the Councils of Ministers of the Union republics, discussed how the decisions of the government connected with insuring spring field work are being fulfilled.

[Begin recording] [Stepanyuk] The rather harsh tone of the meeting was set from its very first minutes by the prime minister himself: What problems had not been resolved, who had not resolved them, and what must be done without delay. The relevant ministries were subjected to sharp criticism for the disruption in supplies of spare parts, fuel, and polythene sheeting. Hundreds of chemical and other plants have been closed down in the country for ecological considerations. As a result there is a shortage of fertilizers and means of plant protection. On each of these difficult questions, some sort of compromise decisions were scrupulously worked out. Today there is serious discussion of the results of this work.

Vyacheslav Ivanovich, you have been in the post of minister of agriculture for only a few days. Of course, you have a great many problems, but all the same, how can we avoid last year's mistakes, when agricultural workers gathered in a record harvest but the country was left with half-empty granaries?

[Chernoivanov] Well, first of all I would like to say that today's meeting of the Cabinet of Ministers provided a reply to your question. Today there is discussion of those practical mistakes and those omissions which took place last year in order to specify them in advance and to make the appropriate decisions on them. But what questions were discussed today and what questions were not resolved? Primarily, it is a matter of material and technical supplies for the whole spring campaign. There was an urgent conversation about providing resources, spare parts, tractors, polythene sheeting, packaging, fuel and lubricants. And these are the questions which it is essential to resolve right now.

And the second particular feature, I would say, of today is that the government, the Cabinet of Ministers, has adopted in advance all the documents which last year were adopted somewhat later and which were unable to affect the gathering of the harvest and reducing its losses. What documents are these? These are the package of documents connected with providing the material resources and also the decision of the Cabinet of Ministers on involving in the harvest and in the spring work townspeople, students, and in general all the categories of people who should participate in this process. I think that a large amount of work should now be done by those working in agriculture to conclude contracts with enterprises and organizations for those many tasks which it is necessary to fulfill.

Here I would like to note one other particular feature which was discussed here at the Cabinet of Ministers. It is the question of involving industrial enterprises in giving assistance to agriculture to prepare equipment, repair it and to prepare the whole threshing process, the

driers and grain threshers. In general, all of this work was always previously carried out by involving industrial enterprises. I think that the adoption of those normative documents that have been adopted by the government will help to avoid those mistakes which we made last year in gathering the harvest. [end recording]

Discussion Summarized

LD1503083191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2215 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, 15 Mar (TASS)—A meeting of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers on 14 March considered progress in fulfilling government decisions on preparing for and carrying out spring fieldwork. Reports were heard from V.I. Chernoivanov, USSR minister of agriculture and food, and the leaders of the governments and the ministers of Union republics in charge of the affairs of the agro-industrial complex.

The speeches emphasized that this spring, the volume of field work to be carried out is considerably greater than in past years due to the fact that last autumn's unfavorable conditions did not make it possible at that time to carry out the whole complex of agrotechnical measures. It was noted that, on the whole, the decisions of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers on matters relating to material and technical provision for the countryside are being implemented. Enterprises and organizations of Union ministries and departments have begun to carry out work in a more organized way. However, the discussion showed that many problems with the performance of spring work are being tackled in an unsatisfactory way. There was sharp criticism of the organizations and enterprises of the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, the petrochemical and chemical industries, and agricultural machine-building which had not ensured the planned supply of material and technical resources to the countryside.

The main body of farms in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], the Belorussian SSR, the Uzbek SSR, and a number of regions of the Russian Federation have prepared for better sowing than last year. At the same time, there is concern about the poor organization of equipment repairs at many collective and state farms and the unsatisfactory preparation of seeds. Only half of the grain crop seed stocks at farms in the Russian Federation, Armenia, and Turkmenia have been brought up to first and second class sowing condition. Throughout the country, as a whole, there is a shortage of almost one-fifth of seed potatoes, and their purchase from the population, as has happened in the past, has not been organized. In a number of Union republics, there has been an underrating of work to man the farms with cadres of machine-operators, in particular by attracting them from industrial and other enterprises, as well as with graduates of agricultural vocational and technical colleges.

Acknowleding the impermissibility of delay in preparing collective and state farms for spring fieldwork, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers considered it necessary to adopt additional measures to improve supplying the enterprises and organizations of the agroindustrial complex with fuel oils, spares for tractors and other agricultural equipment, polyethylene film, mineral fertilizers, plant protective agents, and packaging materials.

Personal tasks were entrusted to USSR ministry and department heads V.I. Chernoivanov, N.A. Pugin, A.N. Ustkachkintsev, N.M. Olshanskiy, P.S. Fedirko, and V.V. Melashchenko to organize the smooth and effective fulfillment of the measures outlined at the USSR Cabinet of Ministers meeting.

Note was taken of statements by representatives of Union republics that for their part everything necessary will be done to ensure timely execution of spring fieldwork.

Summarizing the discussion, USSR Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov emphasized that preparing farms for fieldwork is the most urgent priority task. A key point of reference in this must be improvements in supplying the population with food. The country's government will keep its attention focused on the problems of the agroindustrial complex and will ensure the most favorable economic conditions for the complex's work. In the near future, the government will, in particular, consider matters regarding preparations for gathering the harvest and laying in feed and with the work of food industry enterprises during the agricultural produce mass reception season.

Military

Army, Navy Create 20 Referendum Districts

PM1403160391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Mar 91 Union Edition p 2

[V. Litovkin report: "What the Army Will Vote For"]

[Text] "Citizens of those republics where a decision not to participate in the All-Union Referendum has been adopted will be able to express their will together with servicemen and members of their families at the referendum polling places created on the territory of military units," Lieutenant General Yevgeniy Popov, spokesman for the USSR Armed Forces Main Military-Political Directorate, declared at a meeting with journalists.

Twenty referendum districts have been created in the Army and Navy. Twelve of these are in the groups of Soviet forces in East European countries and in Mongolia, and eight are in republics where there are no central electoral commissions. Three are in the Baltic region, and there is one in Moldova, one in Georgia, one in Armenia... In all, 6,872 referendum polling places have been created in military units. On the territory of Azerbaijan, servicemen will participate in the referendum in accordance with recent decisions of the republic's leadership.

In addition, the general reported, servicemen and members of their families will participate in the polls being conducted in the republics by decision of the local authorities.

The USSR Ministry of Defense is not incurring any expenditure in holding the referendum. All work is being paid for by the USSR Central Electoral Commission, including [payment] in foreign currency for the groups of forces.

"We are convinced," Lt. Gen. Ye. Popov told journalists, "that the Army will vote for the renewed Union by an absolute majority. A preliminary poll of servicemen, conducted by a group of military sociologists one month ago, showed 80 percent of servicemen in favor of the Union, while by that time 15 percent had not yet determined their opinion, and just 5 percent declined to answer."

MiG-31 Explodes on Takeoff; Pilots Killed

LD1403151591 Moscow TASS in English 1504 GMT 14 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Khot]

[Text] Krasnoyarsk March 14 TASS—Two pilots were today killed by the explosion of a MiG-31 fighter in the area of Khatanga, 2,500 kilometers away from Krasnoyarsk.

The plane exploded when making a vertical take-off. A special commission is investigating the crash.

Samara Exhibit Shows Military Conversion Gains

PM1203145391 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 8 Mar 91

[Report by L. Krechetova in Samara, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] We have been talking a great deal about conversion at defense industry enterprises. In my view, we've been discussing this topic more than is warranted by the changes actually taking place in this sphere. Another conference has been held—in Samara—on this question.

[Krechetova] This conference has been scheduled to coincide with an exhibition of new products. From them you can judge just how great the sector's potential is. [Video shows equipment] This is a stereo cassette recorder incorporating a compact disk player. There are all kinds of recording equipment, multiband receivers, and mini washing machines on display. These have been put into production very rapidly by the Biysk "Sibpribormash" Association. The "Fermer" unit, based on the "Druzhba" power saw, and its accessories make it possible to do all kinds of land work on plots. Some 80 percent of capacity at the "Sibpribormash" has been switched to the production of these and other articles. At the Yoshkar-Ola Mechanical Plant, 100 percent of capacity has been given over to bicycle production. Output is heading for 900,000 bicycles a year. The conference was held at the "Zavod imeni Maslennikova" Association in Samara, which has built up useful experience in the rapid restructuring of management personnel and design talent. But, like all enterprises in the sector, it is suffering from a lack of modern equipment, high-tech production lines, and raw materials. [Video shows V.S. Revenko, deputy chief of a main administration at the USSR Ministry of the Defense Industry, identified by caption]

[Revenko] In the next four or five years the sector must switch around 75 percent of its capacity to consumer goods production, leaving just 22-25 percent of capacity unconverted. We must expedite the law on conversion and ensure some kind of social protection for our enterprises under the conditions of conversion. Then I think the sector will move considerably faster and more intensively toward the achievement of this goal.

[Krechetova] If the production capacity freed up by conversion works to the fullest extent, billions of rubles worth of sophisticated domestic equipment, devices, and other goods will appear in the consumer-goods market.

Baltic Republics

Estonian Legislature Official Views Referendum

LD1403151891 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1800 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Excerpts] Now about Estonia. The Supreme Soviet today held its third meeting within the 33d session. Gunnar Paal will present a brief summary of what was discussed.

[Paal] The illusion that it is possible to divert Estonia from the path to independence must be stopped, said Deputy Speaker Marju Lauristin before voting took place on a Republic of Estonia Supreme Soviet resolution. The resolution was adopted with 57 votes for, 17 against, and one abstention. So, it has now been laid down that within a month we will have to elaborate an action plan for ways for us to proceed.

[Begin recording] [Lauristin] Yes, today's lengthy discussion at the supreme soviet—should we adopt this resolution or not—in my opinion also reflects the situation which has developed within the supreme soviet within the past few months. We have in a way managed to avoid many very serious decisions and dealt with all kinds of minor matters instead. In the opinion of our deputy group, who presented the draft, after the March referendum, we simply have no moral right to avoid taking those steps, those decisions associated with furthering independence. These concern adopting resolutions on ownership reform in the economic sphere, legal resolutions which Mr. Ruutel also spoke about in his report; the issue of our finally achieving full control, full state-authority control on the territory of Estonia, which is, for example, also related to law and order and the fight against crime; and there are perhaps dozens and dozens of these issues, perhaps even hundreds. At the moment it is necessary to rally all political forces, in my opinion, in order to make it clear to ourselves which specific matters are involved. [passage omitted]

Certain differences of opinion will remain, but the supreme soviet must still arrive at a clear understanding, for the benefit of the Estonian people, of what must be done, what is related to what, so that this ambiguity, this state of uncertainty—perhaps tomorrow suddenly someone will declare that the transition period has come to an end, and what will happen then?—is lifted; and to demonstrate that these steps—practical steps, not declarations, resolutions, or decisions by any one person, group, or body—will lead us to independence. [passage omitted]

[Paal] The 17th of March is approaching and the all-Union referendum, alas, will be organized in various areas. Some officials are undecided: What will be done to those who are organizing it, or what will be done to those who are taking part?

[Lauristin] According to a supreme soviet resolution, one must make it clear to oneself that all resolutions of local bodies to assist in organizing the all-Union referendum amount to local initiative. In the Estonian state, no one can force a person to organize this all-Union referendum. If elections committee members or somebody else is being threatened somehow to take part in the organizing against their will, then there is no right of any kind to do so.

At the same time, it would of course be very good if deputies, if political forces also on that day did the same job as on 3 March; that is, the job of observers, because the danger of falsifying results is considerably greater on the 17th than it was on the 3d. Third, the people who want to, and who feel that they are indeed citizens of the Soviet Union, and who in true spirit want to help the development of the USSR in any one direction and want to do so by voting, we must accept those people as such; exactly as Estonian people in Sweden or Finland were allowed to participate—they were helped so that they could participate in our referendum. If the local Kohtla-Jarve or Narva town authority assists its own citizens (?to participate in the USSR referendum), then this is their own initiative, and the free will of those people. We need not view it as some kind of activity against the Estonian state, as some suggested in this hall.

In my opinion, we should at present proceed from the fact that it is also important to us to find out truthfully how many people in Estonia still consider themselves namely and solely USSR citizens, who ties their fate with the Union future. [end recording]

Estonian 'Intimidation' Over Poll Reported

LD1403105291 Moscow TASS in English 0841 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Report by TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kharchenko: "Estonia: Intimidation Against All-Union Poll Respondents"]

[Text] Tallinn March 14 TASS—Despite the fact that the March 17 all-Union referendum will not be held in Estonia, a republican parliament resolution specially points out that citizens of the USSR here may take part in it on the basis of a free expression of will.

However, the deputies' groups "For Equal Rights", "Cooperation", "Virumaa" and the communist group in the republican parliament doubt that, particularly after an inteview with Andres Kork, chairman of the Tallinn City Council, was published in the local press.

Vladimir Lebedev, a deputy to the republican parliament, quoted an excerpt from the interview as saying that Mr. Kork believes that "lists of those taking part in the all-Union referendum will subsequently be a help in the compilation of a register of voters of the Estonian Republic and appointments with due account of citizenship".

"So, you see, the interview contains a practical threat to deprive those, who intend to go to the polls on March 17, of Estonian citizenship," Lebedev said.

The newspaper MOLODEZH ESTONII on Wednesday published an interview with Nikolay Zakharov, chairman of the referendum commission and deputy to the Estonian parliament.

Zakharov assured those who feel some fear that "all polling lists are not subject to be made known. They will be eliminated after the counting of votes by a decision of the polling commissions".

"Our opponents declare at all levels and particularly at the international level that a really democratic open society, in which there is no room for the persecution of dissidents, is being built in Estonia now," Zakharov said.

But how does Andres Kork's pronouncement fit into such declarations?

Estonian Presidium To Reorganize Structure

LD1403172391 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1300 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Summary] Today's session of the Estonian Supreme Soviet has decided to disband its presidium in its present form. The new presidium will include seven directly elected supreme soviet deputies, instead of permanent commissions' chairmen as in the existing presidium—chairman, speaker and his two deputies.

Deputy Illar Hallaste, a Christian Democrat, made the same proposal to change the presidium last May and November, when it did not receive sufficient support. Hallaste says that the People's Front had proportionally too many seats in the presidium because of its majority within the supreme soviet. Reporter Gunnar Paal asked Hallaste if he thinks that today his proposal was adopted because the People's Front is in decline.

[Hallaste] "No, I do not think so. I see it as a positive move, as the People's Front's greater readiness to cooperate. It is simply that the elation that the People's Front had won the elections and is now the ruling party in Estonia deciding all the matters on its own this elation has passed."

TASS on Latvian 'Plan' To Seize Riga TV Center

LD1403170891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1615 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Riga, 14 Mar (TASS)—The command of the Special Force Militia Detachment [OMON] of USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs troops stationed in Latvia has announced that "radical nationalist circles are planning a large-scale provocation in the city of Riga between 14 and 17 March." In a statement published here today, the OMON leadership reported that "the republican television center is planned to be the area for holding the action".

According to OMON figures, a group of around 50 fighters, disguised in OMON uniforms, armed with automatic weapons and in military vehicles, is intending to carry out a dramatization of the storming of the television center building. "Responsibility for possible victims among the civilian population and among militia men guarding the television center must be placed with OMON," the statement stresses.

The command of the OMON detachment thinks that the goal of this plan is to wreck the holding of the USSR referendum, to break up OMON, and to attract the attention of the international community to the situation in Latvia. It has made a protest against the provocation being prepared and said that all responsibility for the possible consequences will rest with the organizers and the direct participants in the action.

Commenting on the OMON statement in an interview with a TASS correspondent, Janis Baskers, director of the Latvian Department of Public Security, said that OMON's duty is to pass on the information it has to the procurator's office. "As regards detachments of voluntary guardians of order subordinate to the department, then they do not have weapons, OMON uniforms and military vehicles," he claimed.

In turn Aloiz Vaznis, Latvian minister of internal affairs, reported that the ministry had not received the information the statement talks about. Speaking at a news conference here today, he stressed that "if OMON, subordinate to the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, has specific information about preparations for a particularly dangerous and serious crime, then it is the duty of the Union ministry to institute criminal proceedings and begin an investigation." The minister claimed that there are no armed fighters in Latvia, but he promised to reinforce the guard at the radio and television center.

Latvian Official Denies Plan

LD1403171591 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1600 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Janis Baskers, director of the Department of Public Security of the Council of Ministers of Latvia, is at the microphone:

[Baskers] The statement in SOVETSKAYA LATVIA by the command of OMON [Special Force Militia Detachment] alleges that it it has data at its disposal to the effect that radically minded nationalist circles are preparing an attack on the television center; moreover, that this group of fighters, possessing OMON uniforms and armed with automatic weapons, intends to drive in militia vehicles.

The Department of Public Security does not have data at its disposal that such a group exists in the republic, and we have no information about this attack. If OMON has such information at its disposal, I think that it should provide this information to the procuracy, and the procuracy will carry out an investigation and clarify matters. Well, I think such a statement is one possible

way to use such statements to perform their own attack, or an attack of some other forces on the television center, so as to be able later, under the guise of this statement, to have denied responsibility in advance. I consider this statement to be provocative.

Landsbergis Sees Soviet Takover After Referendum

TA1503091391 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0805 GMT 15 Mar 91

[Text] The Lithuanian president claims that in the last few days there has been a massive penetration by Soviet forces into the Baltic states where there is concern that the aim is to take over control immediately after Sunday's referendum in the USSR. The Baltic states have refused to participate in the referendum. Gid'on Remez talked with the Lithuanian president a few minutes ago.

[Begin recording] [Remez] President Vytautas Landsbergis stressed in a talk from his Vilnius office that despite Soviet promises to the West, the infiltration of forces into the Baltic states has been continuing all the time. In the last few days the number of soldiers has been so great that the usual excuse of maneuvers has become completely transparent.

[Landsbergis, in English] These days the new Soviet troops are going into Lithuania. We do not know what are they go. [sentence as heard] Sometimes they are speaking about a maneuver, but now this tragedy is so big that we are very troubled about a possible new action against our government.

[Remez] The Soviet soldiers are already provoking the Lithuanian police guard, detaining civilians, and staging terrorist actions as provocations. Their very presence, Landsbergis said, of course contradicts the agreement between U.S. Secretary of State Baker and Bessmertnykh in Washington several weeks ago. We will now try to reach Baker in Moscow to tell him because another bloody incident, such as that took place near Vilnius' television tower, could take place at any moment, Landsbergis added. On Sunday, despite the Lithuanian Government's refusal, Soviet units will try to hold among themselves the referendum on the new alliance as proposed by President Gorbachev. It will also be held among Russian laborers in factories in Lithuania. We have no means to prevent the voting or to supervise it, Landsbergis said. Since Gorbachev and his people will concoct the results of the referendum in their favor they might try to implement the new alliance on the rejectionist Baltic states by means of their Army, he said. [end recording]

Lithuania Attempts To Halt Referendum Voting

PM1503121391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Mar 91 Second Edition p 3

[Report by correspondent Yu. Stroganov: "In Conditions of Moral Terror: The Union Referendum Has Begun in Lithuania"]

[Excerpts] Vilnius—Those inhabitants of the republic who will not be able to express their opinion on our country's future on 17 March got such an opportunity today. Polling places are open for voting from 14 March in Lithuania. [passage omitted]

"The republic's mass media have unleashed an unbridled propaganda campaign against the referendum," A. Naudzunas, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, told me. "Warnings of dismissal from work have begun to be made for participation in it."

The republic's leadership has rescinded the decision of those rayon soviets which came out in favor of conducting the USSR referendum. The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Presidium appealed to self-government bodies, officials, and leaders of enterprises and organizations to "stop these hostile and criminal activities which are detrimental to the state." [passage omitted]

Radio Vilnius on Chance for Voting Anomalies

LD1403212591 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 2000 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Although officially the Soviet Union's referendum is to take place on 17 March, it started in Lithuania three days earlier, on 14 March. The law has been treated so freely because, it is said, the Lithuanian authorities may hinder the organization of this event.

In reality the largest possible number of votes is being sought, not in one but in all four days. It is not by accident that of the total number of 23 polling stations in Vilnius, two have been opened at the railway station and the airport. Thus the votes not only of those arriving and departing, but also of transit passengers will be collected.

Other polling stations are housed in the CPSU or in occupied buildings like the Press Palace, military units and offices, and in several enterprises subordinated to Moscow.

Since there are no lists of voters, the same person can vote as many times as he wants, moreover, as it is not difficult to visit all polling stations in the course of four days. Apart from that, the organizers are also inviting the city's guests to take part in the voting. Such guests may vote today in Vilnius and tomorrow in Riga.

In disregard of the Soviet Union's Constitution and laws, the so-called nationwide referendum is being organized by the communist party and the army. On the whole, the referendum law is being violated at every step. Nobody conceals it. There will be as many votes as Moscow wishes, Chairman Vytautus Landsbergis stated today in the Supreme Council. Such a referendum has no international significance. But this circumstance will not prevent Moscow, basing itself on the results of the referendum, from continuing its pressure on Lithuania, he added.

USSR People's Deputies To Observe Referendum

LD1403233591 Vilnius International Service in English 2230 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Four people's deputies of the Soviet Union came to Vilnius today to observe how the Soviet referendum is organized in some parts of Lithuania. We remind you that some time ago Lithuania declared it could help organize the referendum among Soviet citizens in Lithuania if the Soviet Union made such a request. As no answer was coming from Moscow, the Lithuanian parliament warned the republic's citizens not to render any assistance to those circles who seek to make semblance of the Soviet referendum in Lithuania.

The group of Soviet people's deputies is headed by Academician Yuriy Borodin, who said their mission was humanitarian, parliamentary, and nonpolitical. In an interview broadcast on the occupied television in Vilnius, the academician spoke with great respect about the legitimate authorities of Lithuania and the whole nation. He said he had tried unsuccessfully to get in contact with Vytautas Landsbergis. Before leaving Moscow the four people's deputies of the USSR spoke with Lithuania's permanent representative in the Soviet capital, Egidijus Bickauskas, who is quoted as having said that there was no basis for the people's deputies to contact Lithuanian parliament, as it did not have anything to do with the organization of the Soviet referendum. On matters other than the referendum mission, the Soviet parliamentarians could expect respect corresponding to their high posts.

Beside Academician Yuriy Borodin, other members of the delegation are Valentina Sedotova, editor in chief of SOVETSKAYA ZHENSHCHINA magazine, Filip Popov, introduced as having great organization experience, and Sergey Shuvalov, who was characterized on television as outstanding cultural figure, and who said he had come Soviet Lithuania to see what color democracy was here.

Lithuanian CP Aide on Referendum Preparations

PM1403151591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Mar 91 Second Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent Yu. Stroganov: "There Will Definitely Be a Referendum!; The Country's Future Will Be Decided by All of Us"]

[Text] Vilnius—On 4 March the Lithuanian Congress of Democratic Forces set up a coordination council for the preparation and holding of the 17 March USSR referendum on our country's future. As is well known, the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Presidium and Lithuanian Government regard work for the preparation and holding of the referendum in the republic as crude interference in its internal affairs, and the measure itself as... the referendum of "a foreign state." Communists in the Nemanskiy region think differently. District meetings of the party aktiv were held throughout Lithuania on 2 March, at which the question of the people's participation in the forthcoming referendum was discussed. Communists have decided to play an active role in its organization. How is this major political measure to be undertaken, however, if the present Lithuanian leadership is trying to block it?

"Communists have not only expressed their opinion at district meetings," Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Secretary A. Naudzhyunas said. "We have also held a conference of the republic party aktiv, at which the general opinion was that there must be a referendum. We have appealed to labor collectives, military units, and rayon soviets to implement the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution. We have also asked the Congress of Democratic Forces to set up a coordination council....

"That council has now begun work. Despite opposition from forces trying to wrench Lithuania from the family of our country's fraternal peoples, we have received news that electoral districts and polling places are being set up.

"Citizens' committees are also playing an active role in this work. Communists are giving substantial help everywhere.

"Communists are concerned, however, by the republic authorities' fueling of tension and confrontation," A. Naudzhyunas said.

"They will try by every means possible to block activity at the polling places," the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee secretary said. "We already have information on threats issued to people who have decided to express their attitude to the Soviet Union's existence on 17 March. How is one to interpret the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Resolution 'On the Conduct and Actions of Institutions of Authority and Citizens of the Lithuanian Republic in the Event of Active Occupation by the USSR,' for example? It states that, 'in the event of further aggressive actions by the Soviet Union against the Lithuanian Republic and its maintaining the potential for active occupation,' the only laws to have force in any circumstances are those adopted by the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Soviet; the decision taken in this connection is that all officials must refuse to cooperate with the 'occupationists,' and citizens are urged to civil disobedience. What is this? A call for armed resistance on the eve of the referendum?"

A. Naudzhyunas is nevertheless confident that, despite all the threats and vetoes, a substantial number of the republic's citizens will take part in the referendum.

Stankevicius Cables USSR on TV Center Seizure

LD1403202191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1705 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Deputy chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, Ceslovas Stankevicius, has sent a telegram to the first deputy chairman of the USSR

Council of Ministers, Vitaliy Doguzhiyev, expressing profound concern that the USSR military is still occupying the seized radio, television and other buildings of the Republic of Lithuania.

Hope is expressed that the USSR Government will take steps soon to return the buildings.

Although since the meeting between Ceslovas Stankevicius and Vitaliy Doguzhiyev, where the first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers promised to clarify the state of affairs, two weeks have elapsed, and no information from Moscow on this issue has been received.

Thus, the telegram to Vitaliy Doguzhiyev is another reminder about a very important problem to us, noted Andrius Azubalis, the press representative of the Supreme Council, at today's briefing.

RSFSR

Yeltsin Addresses Republic on Referendum

LD1503160791 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1200 GMT 15 Mar 91

[Address by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, supreme soviet chairman, moderated by Radio Rossii commentator Boris Morkovnikov, in the Radio Rossii studio on 14 March—recorded]

[Text] [Morkovnikov] Boris Nikolayevich, today is 14 March. After a relatively short period of time you are again, for the umpteenth time, speaking on Radio Rossii. I think that the listeners of Radio Rossii are pleased with this, but, as the reaction in the past few days has shown, there are forces other than Radio Rossii listeners for whom this evokes a completely different reaction. In the final analysis, it is their problem.

In a recent speech you called the month of March a very difficult month. It is a spring month during which life for the rest of the year is prepared, in practical terms, because the year starts in the spring and life starts in the spring. That is why we want to touch on the problems that arise for our fellow countrymen in the spring. Although we have become accustomed to starting with political problems, we will begin with one of the most important problems, an essential problem, that of land, the problem of our daily bread.

[Yeltsin] My esteemed fellow countrymen, citizens of Russia:

When I spoke on Radio Rossii I promised, before the referendum, to have yet another meeting with you. I am fulfilling my promise. It is a matter of great regret that it is, perhaps, only Radio Rossii that is still standing firm in the face of fierce offensive against glasnost. It is necessary to make use of this airtime and of this meeting with you, since a television meeting will not take place, at Kravchenko's wish.

The first question is that of food and agriculture—the land in the spring. Surely it is obvious to everyone that what is needed is to have radical changes in the agrarian sector. We will be unable to feed ourselves if we leave everything as it has been. On land reform is already under way on Russia's huge territory. Its aim is this: At long last, land will have a master on it and farms run by peasants and by farmers, along with horticulture, market-gardening, and livestock-breeding, will be extensively developed. Reflect on these figures: 3 percent of individual, personal farms on Russia's territory feed 27 percent of the population of the Russian Federation.

The first steps are already being taken to restore the Russian peasantry—a stratum of people who, by their labor, will, I am confident, manage to feed the country. The Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation has adopted laws on land reform, on peasant farms. The government of Russia has adopted a republican program of land reform and made a number of decisions. In this way, a legal basis has been created to resolutely introduce land reform in practice. It is now extraordinarily important not to lose time and make land available to all who want it no later than 15 April. I repeat, we have exactly one month, until 15 April. Carrying out the reform has been entrusted to the soviets of people's deputies and to the committees in charge of land reform.

Meeting people in various regions of Russia, I have come across a situation in which many people do not know where to turn as far as these questions are concerned. The procedure for acquiring land is as follows. I simply wish to explain it.

To get land for orchards or vegetable gardens, residents of kray and oblast centers may apply to the oblast and kray soviets of people's deputies. Residents of other towns and populated areas may apply to the corresponding rayon or town soviets. In connection with the grave situation, the Russian Federation Council of Ministers has made a decision on state and collective farms allocating 5 to 7 percent of arable land—I repeat, arable land, not some unsuitable plots—to town residents for growing vegetables this year. On the basis of decisions by the soviets, committees for land reform should effectively allocate such plots as soon as possible and should issue the necessary documents confirming rights to land. In other words, practically all the acts of land tenure should be reregistered by this date.

Transfer of land into ownership or as property inherited for life to run a rural economy is a special issue. The following procedure applies here: Residents of towns and populated areas who are not employed at agricultural enterprises should submit applications to the rayon or town soviet of people's deputies that controls the land allotment in question. Decisions on providing land, following the applications, should be made within a

month in accordance with the law. Employees of state and collective farms and other agricultural enterprises who wish to quit them in order to run a peasant economy, should apply to the management board and the directorate of the economic entity. Samples of all the necessary documents are available in rayon and oblast committees for land reform. On the basis of a collective farm—naturally, with farm members' consent—cooperatives of land owners can be set up in which land should be divided equally among collective farm members, including pensioners. The management board or the directorate of an agricultural enterprise should forward their conclusion to the rayon soviet of people's deputies within a month in order that they adopt corresponding decisions. Consent of the team of the collective or state farm is not required—and I draw you attenton to this point—for quitting the farm and obtaining land as well as a proportion of the means of production.

Today maximum efforts should be made to ensure that citizens' applications be examined objectively, promptly, and without procrastination. I am receiving signals from various areas of the country about cases in which decisions of local bodies of power on this issue are being sabotaged.

It is no longer surprising that it is the local party bodies that organize this destructive work, fulfilling the decisions of central committees rather than complying with the laws of Russia. I think that, in the final analysis, it will subsequently make it possible for us to find those who can call to account, those who should be held responsible for the fact that in some places, in some regions, the land reform will not be carried out and land will not be made available to those who want it and are able to fill it. I consider it necessary to remind everyone that every citizen has a legally guaranteed right to obtain land. If someone, anyone, violates this right, those guilty will be called to account in accordance with the law. Russia's law and order protection bodies will unswervingly apply this law.

The land reform is calculated to take several years, but I appeal to all those upon whom its carrying out depends to adopt the necessary measures before the start of the spring field work, so that those who apply get the land and make use of it to increase food production. The local soviets of people's deputies and those employed in the committees in charge of the land reform ought to expend maximum efforts in order to ensure that those who so wish get the land in March or April this year. If this succeeds, we will be able to push back the threat of hunger. I do not shy away from saying this. We will be able to remove the social tension and we will be able to lay the foundation for resolving the food problem in Russia.

[Markovnikov] Boris Nikolayevich, we are evidently facing a situation and living in a time in which this endless sequence of its hampers the implementation of many plans. I suppose that the problem of the coming referendum belongs in the category of these ifs—the large and serious ones. It would be nice to hear your viewpoint today, on the eve of the referendum.

[Yeltsin] During the meetings in oblasts, where I was in the summer, as well as during the last meeting with our radio listeners on the air, courtesy of Radio Rossii, I said I would express my point of view on the referendum before 17 March. As is known, the Union referendum deals with the question of the necessity of introducing the post of president in our republics, elected by all the people.

I hear many questions on the issue of holding these referendums. People ask me to give explanations, to speak on the matters. As there is less clarity and more doubts about the Union referendum, I will begin with this one.

The attitude toward the Union referendum in the country is ambiguous. This can be seen from the media. Various opinions are being voiced in Russia, too. I want to stress that the majority of the citizens of our republic are for the Union. This is clear enough even without the referendum, and there is no need to hold it. But even among the supporters of the Union, a number of people have made a decision to vote negatively in the referendum. This is happening, but not without reason. There is a great deal of confusion. First of all, there is the vagueness, the ambiguity of the way the question has been worded. It is not without reason that in a number of the republics this wording has been changed for better clarity and precision. On reading this sentence, one has a feeling that those who composed it were deliberatley trying to make it sound more complicated, to pull some wool over our eyes. Here is the question we are required to answer: Do you consider necessary the preservation of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics as a renewed federation of the equal sovereign republics where the rights and liberties of each person of any nationality will be fully guaranteed?

The first requirement of any refrendum is that the wording of the question be extremely simple, clear, brief, and unequivocal so that each citizen can answer yes or no. I personnally would find very difficult to give an unequivocal answer to this qeustion, although I support the Union, but only the one that the republics will be joining of their own free will and not by force. I have my doubts on many points here.

First, what is meant by the preservation of the Union? Even today there are several republics that have declared their intention to suceed from the Union. In the three Baltic republics, public opinion polls were held and the majority supported succession. If I answer yes to this part of the question the preservation of the Union, what am I voting for? For the leadership of the Union to keep the republics within the union at any price, even by using violence against the civilian population and against the will of the majority of the population? Or for something else, perhaps? It is completely unclear. We are required to say unequivocally yes or no.

Second, what is the renewed Union? To what extent will it be renewed? Will they just paint the facade, or take a course toward substantial changes? Will this be renewal according to the scenario from the center or, at last, according to the republics' wishes?

All this remains unclear, even with the wording of the question proposed for the referendum.

Third, in the wording of the question there is an unequivocal indication that the Union will remain socialist. By this definition they are essentially trying to get from the people approval of the old, moribund system. But a number of republics have already removed that concept from their names. They will have to return to what has already been overthrown. What is to happen if they do not want that? Already today many of the republics' laws seem to the center to be too radical and bold. Will there not arise the temptation, under cover of the results of the referendum, to step up pressure on the republics even more and to strengthen the center?

Furthermore, the leaders of the CPSU and the Russian Communist Party love to refer to the fact that, 74 years ago, a socialist choice was made. That is our destiny, and we must tread that path at all costs. That claim is not uncontested. It would be more honest to ask those living now about their attitude toward the socialist choice instead of referring to the opinion of our forbears. If they really want to find out the people's opinion, it is better to submit precisely that question, separately, instead of slipping it in among others. People will then be able to answer whether or not they wish to press on, under the leadership of CPSU officials, toward the peak of communism.

Fourth, the last part of the question is about human rights and freedoms. It is incomprehensible why, in general, that wording has been inserted into the referendum. It is even considered simply immoral. Can it be that the Union leadership does not have a clear stance on whether or not it is necessary to fully guarantee the rights and freedoms of a person of any nationality? That is the very first obligation and a vital task of the state. That is clear even without a referendum. That is the ABC of democracy. I simply cannot believe that the leadership seriously thinks that we, the people, for so it is considered, can have two views on the subject: one in favor of guaranteeing the rights and freedoms of a person of any nationality, and another against—that is, in favor of arbitrary rule, repression, and the division of people into different classes. It is quite impossible to say yes separately to this section of the question.

This is, of course, being done deliberately, in order to openly intimidate people, to get the answer that is needed to the whole question. No one should be under any illusion that the Union leadership wishes in earnest to find out the view of the people on what path to proceed along and what policy to pursue. The referendum is being conducted with one calculation in mind—that the current policy of the country's leadership receives support. It is aimed at preserving the imperial and unitarian essence of the Union and its system, but makes it possible to renew it only externally. There are already certain results: there are several hotbeds of fierce interethnic strife; there are hundreds of thousands of refugees; there is the wish of several republics to tear themselves out of a Union such as this, and so on. But it is not just the center that has made its wishes known; the republics have also made their wishes known. No one is comfortable with the old Union—not a single republic, irrespective of whether it has declared its withdrawal or not. As for Russia, we are for a radical renewal of the Union and for Russia remaining in the renewed Union. But we mean a Union that would not be to the liking of the upper echelons of bureaucrats, but that would be to the liking, first and foremost, of the republics themselves and their peoples. We are for a Union that republics want to join. They would join voluntarily, not by force. If necessary, they could also leave it. We are for a Union of free republics, not colonies of the center. Only a Union such as this will be stable, firm, and strong. The liberties and rights of all citizens will be genuinely guaranteed in it, irrespective of nationality.

The objective process of the formation of the new Union is proceeding from below, from the republics themselves. It is gaining strength. Treaty-based relations are developing—and in various fields—both among the republics that have expressed the desire to be in the Union, and those that want to leave it. This is the best confirmation of the fact that the republics have an interest in each other. There is a mutual attraction and desire to maintain and develop the ties that already exist, but to have this done not in the old style, according to a command from the center, but by the republics themselves, by the will of their peopeles. I am convinced that the republics will follow this course.

A mighty propaganda campaign has been unleashed today over the Union referendum. The gist of it is, as always, fairly simple. It is claimed that if a minority of the population give a positive response in the referendum, the upshot will be all but catastrophe. People are being intimidated, as before, with the notion of civil war, the disentegration of the country, and bloodshed.

In the first place, I am convinced that there will be no civil war. We simply do not have the social conditions for a civil war, since we do not have antagonistic contradictions among individual social strata in our society, among the working class, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia, or between the people and the Army. The country's leadership might send the Army to some individual spot against the civilian population, but as a whole, the Army will not proceed against the people. They are citizens of our country and of Russia too. Therefore, there will not be a civil war. There is simply not the social basis for one. If there are any of these political changes, to put it mildly, they must be made by constitutional means.

On the other hand, they are trying to convince people that in the event of success in the referendum, prosperity will set in, all conflicts will be settled, the crisis will end, and everything will return to normal.

It may be that I am oversimplifying things, but that is precisely the sense of the propaganda. None of this bears any relationship to reality. Whatever might be the outcome of the referendum, the Union will not disintegrate. There is no need to scare people, no need to sow panic over this. Even if the majority of the population says no, the Union will not disappear the next day. Everything will still be in its place. All Union departments will continue to operate as before. The Army and the KGB will still be there. All treaties, international and interrepublican, will still be there. But an unsuccessful referendum will be a signal for the Union leadership that the policies it has been pursuing are in need of serious amendment, that they are not solving and will not solve the existing problems. If the majority of the population say yes in the referendum, the situation likewise will not get any better. For this a vote in a referendum is insufficient. What is needed is simply a different radical policy, a policy of reforms.

However the center might wish it, the previous imperial Union will be no more. It cannot be resurrected. It will not be possible to drive anyone into the Union by force, and even if force is used in an attempt to shackle the republics to the center—an attempt is at present being made through a forcible referendum in Moldova—such a Union will not be strong and will not last long. Moreover, I am sure that the citizens of Russia will not vote for such a Union. It is no longer possible to stifle the sovereignty of republics or to tear asunder their links. Reality will have to be reckoned with. The republics themselves will know how to stand up against possible speculation about the results of the Union referendum. That is what I wanted to say on the question of the Union referendum, as far as voicing my personal opinion is concerned. I think that every citizen should make up his own mind about how to vote. That is the right of every person, and it is for that reason that the RSFSR Supreme Soviet made the decision to hold the referendum on the republic's territory—and without changing the wording, so as not to provoke an artificial confrontation with the center. I am confident that the citizens of Russia will be able to sort out the issue in their minds and make the right decision.

Now, to turn to the question of the Russian referendum. It poses the question of introducing in our republic the post of president, to be elected by all the peoples of Russia. The question is clear and unambiguous, and has to be answered with yes or no. Why did such a question arise? Russia has traditionally been a republic lacking its own authority. Authority resided at the center and with the party bodies. Elections to soviets at all levels were held last year. Much has remained as it was, and this applies not only at the all-Russian level, but in every region and town, and especially at the center. Trust in the authorities at all levels continues to decline, reaching dangerous depths. The colossal concentration of functions in the hands of the president—I mean the Union president—does not help. Neither does the creation of new bodies and the reshuffling of cadres. Some kind of resolute and out of the ordinary steps are needed to strengthen executive authority in the republics above all, but at the local level, too.

The referendum is being held in order to obtain the citizens' agreement to this, to obtain their agreement. We cannot do this without consulting the people. We are not going to follow the example of other structures, including Union ones.

We consider that to strengthen power does not mean to give it a free hand and to permit arbitrary behavior. First of all, it means increasing confidence in it on the part of the people. The only power that is strong is power that is based on the support of the people. Therefore, we consider that the president of Russia should be elected not by a narrow circle but by all citizens of the republic, by the whole people. Over the whole history of Russia, which is over 1,000 years long, this has never happened before. But I think that the time for such a choice has come. People themselves should decide who is to be the republic's supreme leader, from a choice of candidates.

The introduction of the post of president of Russia will be based on the appropriate laws, which are at present being prepared by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. The main thing here is to create a strict legal framework for the actions of the supreme leader of the republic, while at the same time giving him real powers and the opportunity to do real work. The introduction of the post of president will make it possible to strengthen the sovereignty of the republic.

This is understood in other republics, too. Therefore, some of them already have presidents and presidential structures of power. The election of a president of Russia by means of a vote by all the people is only the start of the strengthening of executive power in the republic. The next step is to strengthen it in the localities, first of all in the krays and oblasts.

Every leader at this level should be elected by the population. I am convinced of this. He will have corresponding rights and broad powers, but also personal responsibility. There will then be someone who is answerable to the population that elected him and to the leadership of the republic. It will then simply be impossible to avoid responsiblity and to hide behind the backs of the deputies and the whole party structure.

Of late some republican soviets, and even oblast soviets, at their sessions have made the decision not to hold the Russian referendum on the territory of the corresponding republics and oblasts. In this way the policy of the Central Committee of the communist party is being implemented to wreck the holding of this referendum at any price.

There is nothing surprising that these decisions are being made by those who, louder than anyone else, talk about the war of laws, about the necessity for strict observation of the constitution. As soon as things get down to actual deeds, the supporters of acting in accordance with the law reveal their true face. The decision to boycott the Russian referendum is not some sort of individual action, it is the manifestation of an everyday practice, of the same attitude to the laws and resolutions and decisions by the Russian legislature and government.

Yeltsin continues the tactics of disrupting and disorganising work, no matter what troubles result from this for the people, has become the norm for the opposing structures. This is manifested particularly consistently and systematically in the soviets which find themselves under their influence. Nor is there anything surprising in the acts to disrupt the referendum. They do not want the people to express their views themselves. It is a much more accustomed and comfortable way to speak on behalf of the people, saying what at any given time is convenient for the party apparatus itself. In connection with this, I must say that in the first place, the decisions to revoke the Russian referendum fly in the face of the law and are deemed to have no force in law. In the second place, the soviets that adopted such decisions are duty bound to safeguard the constitutional rights of every citizen of Russia to take part in the referendum and to have his say with regard to the question that is asked. In the third place, if this is not done, all those who are responsible for frustrating the referendum will be brought to account in accordance with the law. I would also like to say something else. Now one can frequently hear the following: The Russian referendum is being staged for Yeltsin; Yeltsin is raring to get into power. Let me say this: During the election campaign, I was in favor of introducing the post of president in Russia. Now, too, I support the institution of the presidency. I have not changed my position for a whole year. If the referendum says yes, I will stand for the post of president. But, if it is me or someone else who is elected, only the voters can determine.

I am sure that not just one candidate will be put forward at the Congress of People's Deputies. Russia has worthy people who are able to fulfill this difficult mission with honor. But the main thing is not who is elected, but the fact that Russia will have no more top leaders picked by a small group of people. Henceforth the president of the republic will be elected only through a nationwide ballot, by us, our children, and our grandchildren. The success of the referendum will be an important victory for democracy and all the people.

I ask the Russian people to bear one other important circumstance in mind. Under Russia's law on referendums, a decision is considered adopted if it receives the vote not of half the citizens who take part in the ballot, as in the Union referendum, but of half of all those who have the right to vote. That is a very fundamental difference. A decision in the republic will be considered adopted if it is supported by no fewer than half of all Russia's voters. I believe that this is just.

In conclusion, I want to appeal to you, esteemed Russians, to be as active as you can in the Russian referendum. At this responsible moment, each vote will be weighty and important. I view your yes answer as support for reforms in our republic, as your personal contribution toward strengthening Russian statehood, which will enable Russia to be a full participant in a renewed union of sovereign states.

[Oleg Poptsov, president of the All-Union State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company] In your last statement, you raised what I view as the extraordinary important problem of combining forces and seeking the necessary interaction in standing up for the ideas of justice, the democratic development of society, and social reforms. I feel that, before the referendum and after it, this problem remains most important. How do you view this combining of efforts?

[Yeltsin] The question you ask, Oleg Maksimovich, is, of course, extraordinarily important. There is no question of my being in favor of seeking enemies. At a time of such complexity for the country and for Russia, what is needed is to come together. People may have different points of view, but even so they converge in some way. it is said, for instance, that the Communist Party is heading certain negative processes, among them agitating against the Russian referendum. Even so, no one ever says it is the whole party that is engaging in such things. In the party, too, there are many communists who are for progressive transformations, for democratization, for further reform, not for returning to the path we have already travelled. I am for the unification of all forces today—democrats, Communists, representatives of other parties and public organizations, and non-party people—who today have a very weighty voice on the political scene. If non-party people were formerly less politicized, today they are politicized and politically literate. At our previous congres, for instance, we had 90 people's deputies who were non-party people; now the figure is 248. That is a serious force, let's admit it. At the Russian Federation's Congress of People's Deputies, their voice will carry a great deal of weight.

[Unidentified speaker] Almost one in four.

[Yeltsin] Yes. Because I am for such a unification of forces I would like to call here on those who actually have such ambitious or other intentions to cast them aside at this time. Destiny is being decided now—the destiny of Russia, the destiny of the country. Perhaps March, or these months, will be decisive. Then history wil, as they say, find all the sinners, and will call them to account for these six years, and for this year, and for what might lie ahead.

[Markovnikov] Yes. One must hold firm and say no to stupidity before the congress, at the congress, and after it.

[Yeltsin] Yes. The congress will be complicated and difficult. I have said that it was foisted upon us. Nevertheless, there are, all the ame, democratic forces. Many communists and people's deputies of the Russian Federation are in a mood to criticize the supreme soviet and its leadership, and the chairman of the supreme soviet and the government, and the leadership of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation for what they might have done but did not do, for some mistakes. That is fair and, at the same time, it is necessary. This is the main thing—to look ahead. The main thing is to move forward and not to retreat. The main thing is to present such constructive proposals at the congress and to expound our program, which is now being finalized, so as to attract not only the people's deputies, but also all the people of Russia in order to implement it and change the social situation, the beggarly existence in which tens of millions of our people find themselves today.

[Markovnikov] Yes, power comes and goes, but Russia remains.

[Yeltsin] Yes.

[Markovnikov] As we think about that, we have to live....

[Yeltsin, interrupting] And Russia must be united.

[Markovnikov] Thank you very much, Boris Nikolayevich.

[Yeltsin] Thank You.

New Public Security Service Established

LD1403140491 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1200 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] The public security service of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Ministry of Internal Affairs—a presentation of which took place in Moscow on 14 March—sees its main task as the protection of citizens in extreme situations. Presenting the new structure, its head, Lieutenant-General of the Internal Service Anikeyev, first deputy minister of Internal affairs of the RSFSR, gave some extremely sad statistics. Last year alone more than 50,000 people were killed in Russia. According to experts' forecasts if the trend doesn't change the losses in the republic's population will exceed half a million by the new millenium. There has been a sharp fall in public activity in insuring law and order. Half of the people's volunteer militia groups have broken up. Komsomol operational detachments have disappeared. It is becoming more and more difficult to find the witneses of crimes. It is essential, therefore, to cast aside political ambition and face up to eternal truths and values—man, his well-being and free development. In organizing the new service the RSFSR Ministry of Internal Affairs has defined the priority area of its own activity—the protection of the life, health, and property of citizens and also his rights, honor, and dignity.

Russia Registers Associations, Political Parties

LD1403181191 Moscow TASS in English 1756 GMT 14 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Ruben Shirinyan]

[Text] Moscow March 14 TASS—The first mass associations and parties in the Russian Federation were granted a republican status. The Russian Justice Ministry today issued registration certificates to 37 of them.

They include the Union of Afghan War Veterans, the Chernobyl Alliance, trade unions and charity and religious organisations. The ministry also registered three political parties: Social Democratic, Democratic and Republican.

"A democratic society cannot exist if it is not based on a multiparty system. We today received the legislative confirmation of our legality, and it is difficult to overestimate this fact," leader of the Russian Democratic Party Nikolay Travkin told TASS.

He said that his party "advocates Russia's revival," and its main task is "opposition to the Soviet Communist Party."

Travkin claimed that his party has 30,000 members. "We have party tickets, and pay dues," he added.

The law on mass associations entered into force in the USSR on January 1, and these associations must be registered at justice bodies in compliance with this law.

Polozkov Says 'No' To Running for Presidency

LD1403195291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1840 GMT 14 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Vasiliy Belousov]

[Text] Murmansk, 14 Mar (TASS)—Ivan Polozkov, leader of the Communist Party of Russia, has answered with a straight "no" the question whether or not he will agree to run for the post of Russia's president, should the population of the republic vote for the introduction of this post in the referendum. He gave his answer today at a meeting with delegates of the Northern Fleet party conference in Murmansk, where he arrived on the eve of the all-Union referendum.

During the meeting Ivan Polozkov stressed the unrealistic nature of the program to stabilize Russia's economy which Boris Yeltsin is advocating. According to Polozkov, this program recognizes only one form of property—private—which is clearly not sufficient for the actual conditions in Russia. The Communist Party of Russia calls for diverse forms of ownership, but with the leading role going to state ownership. The Communists, declared Ivan Polozkov, are categorically against the sale of land, they are calling for a gradual transition to market relations and have their own model for getting the country out of the difficult economic situation.

According to the leader of the Russian Communists, they are the only real force capable of withstanding the chaos and desintegration being forced upon the republic and they are ready to cooperate with all the patriotic forces to achieve this.

Khasbulatov Signs Union Treaty Draft

LD1403174291 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] The first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, Ruslan Khasbulatov, has put his signature to the work draft of a future treaty of the Union. Khasbulatov told the weekly MOSCOW NEWS that he acted on the mandate of the commission of the Republican Congress of Peoples' Deputies set up to take part in drafting the treaty.

We agreed to a compromise because the draft is a product of joint efforts and of mutual concessions by other republics, Khasbulatov explained.

He said that decision was strategically important, and an argument against those who have accused Russia's leaders of taking the Union apart. However, Khasbulatov said that a number of articles of the treaty have still to be finalized.

Khasbulatov Views 17 March Referenda

PM1503095191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Mar 91 Union Edition p 4

[Interview with R. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, by V. Shchepotkin; place, date not given: "Not To Tear Russia Apart With Sovereignties"]

[Text] [Shchepotkin] As is known, two referenda are to be held on the territory of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] 17 March. The all-union one, with its question on the preservation of the unified state, and the all-Russian one, in which citizens are to voice their opinion on the possibility of electing the president of the republic by means of direct elections. However, information has suddenly begun to come in from various places that local organs of power are refusing to hold the Russian referendum. This has been reported from Smolensk, Bashkiria, Tuva, and North Ossetia. I believe that the "parade of refusals" will not end at that. And a whole bunch of questions arises. Are the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and its Presidium concerned about this situation? Is the Presidium undertaking anything to carry through the Russian Supreme Soviet's decision? And are the actions of regional organs of power at all legal in these cases?

[Khasbulatov] I will probably begin by answering the last question. About the legality of the actions. No, these actions are illegal. Illegal in Smolensk Oblast, in North Ossetia, in Bashkiria, and in other places where decisions have been—or might be—adopted not to hold the all-Russian referendum. There is the Law on the Referendum, adopted by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, which unambiguously states: If a referendum is announced, it must be held without fail. The Congress of Russian People's Deputies made an amendment to the RSFSR Constitution which gives a certain number of deputies the right to demand the holding of a referendum on a particular question. And if the number of deputies corresponds to that defined in the constitution—not less than one-fifth—then the Supreme Soviet and its Presidium are obliged to organize a referendum. And that is what we have done...

[Shchepotkin] I will interrupt you, Ruslan Imranovich, so please excuse me. But such a democratic amendment is nonetheless rather hard economically. For a referendum is a costly luxury...

[Khasbulatov] Of course it is costly. And this is why, mindful of this, we decided to save money and hold the Russian referendum on the same day as the all-Union one: 17 March. At the same time we have done everything to combine the two referenda—to prevent extreme forces from opposing both the union and the republican referendum—is that really a bad thing? Here I would like to draw your attention to another detail. Originally our deputies demanded the holding of a referendum on two questions. First: Do you want the RSFSR to be preserved as a unified, multinational state incorporated in the renewed Union...

[Shchepotkin] Incidentally, I like this question very much. As a citizen, I would vote for it with both hands...

[Khasbulatov] I also like it very much. Frankly speaking, I supported it. And the Presidium decided to submit two questions to our, Russian, referendum. On the unity of the RSFSR and on the election of the president of the Russian Federation by the republic's entire population.

At first, everyone perceived this normally: both in the oblasts and in the republics of Russia. But then a fierce struggle and false interpretations began against the first question. The party apparatus of the Russian Communist Party mounted propaganda and criticism. It said the first question was directed against autonomous entities, against their well-being and prosperity...

[Shchepotkin] An interesting picture is glimpsed when you begin to analyze certain facts. Who today is in the front ranks for national independence, for the full sovereignty of a particular autonomous entity? The Supreme Soviets of yesterday's autonomous entities and their leaders. And what is a considerable proportion of the deputies of these soviets like? Who are their leaders? Nomenklatura CPSU cadres, including the present first secretaries of oblast committees or, as they are now, republic committees. But what was he saying yesterday, what aims did he champion, and which did he advocate?

[Khasbulatov] Yesterday he was suppressing all democrats, not allowing even a shoot of national self-awareness to break through, and labeling as nationalists people who express far less radical thoughts. Today, with the help of sovereignty, those same people, having seized upon the national idea, have begun acting the way that is most advantageous to them and their confederates.

[Shchepotkin] Ruslan Imranovich, party bureaucrats are, in my view, one of the forces which have risen up on the national wave and realized that this is the most reliable way of preserving themselves. But still we probably should not close our eyes to overt nationalism too.

[Khasbulatov] True, this exists too. It was through joint efforts that the criticism of the first question in the Russian referendum began, although, I repeat, the tone was set by certain circles in the autonomous entities—and not people's circles but leading circles. Pressure began to be exerted by the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee and the leadership of national republics. Their leaders said: We have no objections to the second question, but remove the first one. And, frankly speaking, both Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin and myself persuaded the deputies, and there were more than 400 of them, not to insist on including the first question on the voting paper. This was a concession, a compromise. What for? So as to torpedo neither the Russian nor the union referendum. For, if we had abandoned our referendum, then left-wing radical forces, as I have already said, would have begun a struggle against the union one.

[Shchepotkin] Nevertheless, the concession did not lead to anything good?

[Khasbulatov] It did not. An attack is now being launched against the holding of the Russian referendum in general. I emphasize: a legitimate referendum substantiated by legal and constitutional norms.

[Shchepotkin] And what are your actions now?

[Khasbulatov] At the last session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, first, we declared illegal the decision of Smolensk Oblast Soviet not to hold the Russian referendum and, second, [we decided] to allow labor collectives to hold the referendum themselves where organs of power issue a refusal. By analogy with the recent USSR Supreme Soviet resolution.

[Shchepotkin] But if people in the provinces, in the same Smolensk, Bashkiria, Tuva, and North Ossetia, by analogy with certain union republics, take no notice of your decision and prohibit the holding of the referendum or, maybe, follow the example of the leaders of one of the republics and even threaten criminal prosecution, then what will you do? Do you have any power at all? And what kind of power is it which is incapable of making its instructions be fulfilled?

[Khasbulatov] Well, with regard to Smolensk, I think the question can be eliminated. Yesterday I received the chairman of our Central Electoral Commission, who said that all is in order there and that they recognize the error of their ways and obey the decision of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Matters are more complex with our autonomous entities. The actions of their leaders—unreasonable actions, I will state bluntly—have greatly disturbed many of our people's deputies. We want to act in a democratic way. But let us investigate. If you, esteemed leaders of autonomous republics, want to secede from the RSFSR, then say so directly. Only first, in accordance with union and Russian laws, ask all your citizens by means of a referendum whether they agree to share your plans. But you say that you do not want to secede, while at the same time you are taking actions directed against RSFSR laws. This is no good and cannot be tolerated...

[Shchepotkin] We have now reached a logical end. At first, certain union republics rejected provisions of the USSR Constitution and began asserting their right not by parliamentary means and without prior arrangement. Could autonomous entities within the Union republics have been expected to treat republican laws with greater respect? Hardly. So, forgive me, Ruslan Imranovich, but, as the people say: You have run up against what you were struggling for. Did the now notorious "parade of sovereignties" not begin with the union republics, and was it not you—I do not mean you personally but those at the helm of power—who set off the avalanche?

[Khasbulatov] Of course not. For some reason everyone accuses us. You, they say, started the war of laws, declarations, sovereignties, etc. And yet it started with the fundamental law which, let us say so frankly, struck a blow at the heart of Russia's unity. It is the USSR Supreme Soviet law of 26 April 1990. It states in black and white that union and autonomous republics are subjects of the USSR. Almost all the autonomous republics of Russia took that law as their cue in declaring themselves sovereign states. This is the source of all this disorder, the "parade of sovereignties," etc. This is what dealt a lethal blow at Russia's unity. And we are now making feverish efforts to preserve the RSFSR as a unified and indivisible state.

But the draft Union Treaty causes me very great concern. I personally proposed taking it as a working basis, taking into account the very great contribution which representatives of both union and autonomous republics made to its preparation. But I am concerned about the fact that the new Union Treaty is designed for the union republics. If we sign it in this form, then Russia, as it has existed within its borders for many centuries, will cease to be a unified state: Dozens of appanage principalities will emerge. No, I am not opposed to anyone's national interests, but both partycrats and nationalists try to portray me in just this way. If someone wants to live apart—fine. But this is what I want to emphasize especially. Let all people, citizens of all nationalities, know what the leaders of autonomous entities will sign in their name. And let them know what this will lead to.

[Shchepotkin] And it will lead, in particular, to the result that Russia's oblasts will also raise the question of their right to be subjects of the Union.

[Khasbulatov] They are already raising this question! Tyumen Oblast, for example. There Soviet Chairman Shafranik—a clever, promising worker, incidentally—he and other comrades say: How are we worse than any autonomous republic? Or Smolensk Oblast again, which we have criticized—how is it not equal, let us say, to the Karelian Republic, whose Supreme Soviet Chairman Stepanov sits on the Federation Council alongside Yeltsin, Nazarbayev, and other leaders of union republics? And what, in that case, have Stavropol Kray or Krasnodar Kray done wrong? No, the unified Russian state cannot be permitted to turn into something amorphous. Comrades have fostered in themselves some illusory idea that it is possible to be a completely independent state while being within another state. Well, let people now create their own defense ministries, foreign ministries, and customs offices in every such small formation and issue their own money. It is absurd to even think of this. Russia was being created for 1,000 years before us, and we do not have the right to pull it to pieces. And the vast mass of people will not let us do so. As far as I know, many people in my native Chechen-Ingushetia reason in the same way. A handful of leaders who yesterday most cruelly oppressed their own people, their own intelligentsia, and their own creative forces, rather weak ones moreover—you know that the people endured grave suffering, were deported, and nonetheless do not even think of seceding from Russia—it is this handful of partycrats that has seized upon the national idea and is trying to drive a wedge between the Russian leadership and Chechen-Ingushetia.

[Shchepotkin] And most importantly, probably, between the peoples. Rulers come and go—peoples remain. In your own North Caucasus many people long ago became interrelated, and millions of interethnic marriages have formed blood ties with other peoples of the country, and now today they want to separate them. They are lining up in fronts, preparing for an offensive against each other, and going ahead of these fronts. But history has shown many times that those who run ahead from both sides manage to dive down before the actual collision. They will survive unscathed, while the peoples, who have absolutely nothing to share, will suffer a great deal before realizing where they have been pushed. If you and your confederates understand this, why do you not speak assertively about this, why do you not address people directly through the mass media?

[Khasbulatov] Pardon me, but you are wrong there. IZVESTIYA is a newspaper which I respect, but even if you will not publish criticism, I will say it. Does your newspaper devote a lot of space to problems of Russia's unity? Not very much. Or let us take other publications: If I speak with their representatives, I will be sure to name them, but I would not like to criticize behind their back. And so, there is a flood of materials in them about the Filshin case, but not a word about the problems of Russia's unity.

[Shchepotkin] We seem to have strayed somewhat from the difficulties of the Russian referendum toward Russian difficulties...

[Khasbulatov] No. We are talking of the authority of the Russian state—the force of its laws. No one has the right to wage war against the state, as certain local leaders who imagine themselves as medieval monarchs try to do. For you and I have already seen how the leaders of certain regions use sovereignty when it is necessary to block some decisions of the Russian Parliament. And the struggle against the referendum is a further example of this. But since you yourself have said that it is necessary to appeal directly to the population more, I urge Russia's citizens to participate in both referenda 17 March. In the union referendum and in our Russian referendum.

Supreme Soviet Presidium Views Referenda

LD1403103591 Moscow TASS in English 0849 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 14 TASS—The Presidium of the Russian parliament discussed on Wednesday the results of visits by working teams led by people's deputies to the Chuvash Republic, Khabarovsk, Voronezh and Moscow regions and the Nenets autonomous area, the Presidium's press service reported today.

Special attention was paid to discussing the implementation of Russian bills and attempts to "block" them by several leaders of local councils who combine their posts with party jobs.

The Presidium called for efforts to step up control over the implementation of bills and resolutions by the Russian Congress of People's Deputies, the parliament and its Presidium and speed up work on bills and legal amendments in line with proposals submitted by local officials.

It also discussed the implementation of the parliament resolution on "measures to ensure the holding of the USSR referendum and the Russian Federation referendum on March 17, 1991".

Decisions, aimed to ensure that all those living in the Russian Federation be able to implement their constitutional right to take part in the referendums, were passed.

Radical Calls for Dismantling Union Scored

PM1503091991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Mar 91 Second Edition p 3

[Article by N. Mikhaylov from under the "Echo" rubric: "Deathwatch Beetles"]

[Text] Telephone call after telephone call... All on more or less the same subject. "PRAVDA keeps on urging

patience and concord. But, in fact, you are just swimming with the current. Take a look at ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA for 5 March."

"At what precisely?"

"At everything. From first page to last."

I looked. Nothing particular caught the eye. The same old wholesale confrontation in the spirit of the "radicals" who produce the paper. Although perhaps even more brazen. On page one it tries to show that it is futile for the miners to "expect charity from the Pavlov government"; the last page carries a photograph of pickets urging soldiers to "turn their weapons on the Kremlin."

But, judging by the telephone calls, it was materials connected with the upcoming referendum that interested readers most. "No to a totalitarian union. Yes to a Russian presidency," the paper proclaims, citing the full text of one of "Travkin's party's" leaflets.

But what are the arguments of these "friends of the people"? To say yes, they adjure, is to "give Gorbachev and Pavlov sufficient authority to stifle and plunder Russia," to "approve the destruction of sovereign Russian statehood," to fly in the face of "B.N. Yeltsin's policy," and, finally, to "enable the CPSU to continue to deceive the people."

Just consider this: Apparently, if one is to believe our "democrats," Gorbachev started the great and onerous cause of perestroyka for the sole purpose of "stifling and plundering Russia." Indeed, the demagoguery knows no bounds. "Again they treat us like fools," was his desperate cry in the paper, as indeed at Sunday's rally. But one must see one's readers or audience as naive, uncomprehending simpletons if they are prepared to believe that saying no to a renewed Union will bring them prosperity, rather than chaos and collapse, long years of hopeless, bloody, ethnic strife, and the destruction of a great country. We and our immediate descendants, whatever banner they march under, be it socialist, "democratic," or even monarchist, would scarcely be able to reassemble what it took centuries to create...

What has this to do with our "radicals," anyway? Their credo, like that of demagogues of all ages, is simple: Go to any lengths to seize power. Including lies and shameless slander. I was just finishing these lines when the editorial office was inundated with dozens of calls about Yeltsin's fist-waving speech at Cinematographers' House and the mail brought another leaflet from the "Democratic Russia" coordinating movement. It included questions and answers. "How does Yeltsin go about creating a Union?" "He concludes equal treaties with the republics," "transfers land to the peasants and plants to the workers," "dismantles the nomenklatura's gravy train"... In short, he is the beneficent father. In the meantime Gorbachev is busy day and night—doing what, do you think? "Inflaming ethnic strife, then sending in troops," "taking money from the people to create antediluvian tanks and missiles and maintain modern dachas for generals," and so on and so forth. Apparently, the president has no other concerns than the generals' dachas. Incredible! Who is treating whom as a fool? I don't think that even during the 1937 trials Yezhov and Beriya's executioners dared tell such blatant and crude lies...

Looking at all this frantic puffing and blowing, one is automatically reminded of the bitter, despairing lines of yet another letter, which was once withheld from publication because, as far as I can figure, of its overly coarse tone. "Do not ruin the country," V. Yermakov of Irkutsk Oblast warned. "It is being destroyed by deathwatch beetles. The larvae have multiplied rapidly and crept into all the cracks, turning to dust the living body of Russia and the people's conscience and honor."

A charge which it would be well worth heeding today.

Newspaper Views Official Anti-Yeltsin Campaign

PM1403161691 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 9, 3-10 Mar 91 p 7

[Article by Len Karpinskiy: "Not Subject to the Common Measure"]

[Text] Gasps of feigned horror greeted Boris Yeltsin's televised interview - as if a catastrophe had occurred and we now faced the Final Judgement. Participants in a plenum of the CPSU Moscow City Committee found Yeltsin's statements not only "impermissible", but even "criminal". Yeltsin's speech, they claimed, was leading (of all things!) to "further destabilization", "uncontrollability" and "chaos". At a sitting of Russia's parliament something similar rang out in the Young Pioneer voice of Svetlana Goryacheva, Vice-Chairperson of the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet, in the shape of a group "Political statement".

Yeltsin's opponents continually dismiss the deeds of this politician: they claim he treats them all the same, that he seeks merely to "vindicate his personal ambitions and claims". These critics basely try to depict Yeltsin as a mediocre political horse trader, waiting for the right moment to step on his opponent to further his own ends. I am no more in favour of one-on-one political battles than they are. Yet this is what we face if we continue to see the conflict a banal setting of personal accounts.

All the democratic leaders, including Yeltsin, have been accused of saying "no" to everything. Yet the main "no" to everything. Yet the main "no" is coming precisely from the ruling Centre. Why? But because the Center has evidently decided in principle to put an end to society's democratic reforms. That is the real source of today's confrontation.

Who torpedoed the 500-day programme, thereby burying the possibility of reconciling the Republics and society as a whole? Who set the interests of Russian and other Republics against those of the Union? Isn't it the

Centre itself, which continues dictating its will to the Republics? What does the renewal of the Union mean - quick reshuffling of powers within the same system or the recognition of the people's genuine sovereignty?

We are told that the new Union will be totally different from the old barracks. Let's assume that the assurances are sincere. But the new head of the Cabinet Valentin Pavlov himself said the other day the relationship between the Union Centre and the Republics was one of "a superior authority to a subordinate one". A chance remark? But he then submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet a draft Law on the Cabinet of Ministers which even the staid Committee on Legislation criticized for its militant centralism. While representives from several Republics work hard discussing the division of power in the draft Union Treaty (they say that several articles have already been agreed upon), Pavlov has already decided everything himself. And as if there had never been a word spoken about any sovereignty of the Republics. The head of the new Cabinet simply copied the structure and distribution functions from the previous USSR Council of Ministers and arrogated more power to himself at the expense of the already trimmed powers of the Supreme Soviet. Now the Cabinet intends to pass decisions which are the prerogative of parliament-and submit them directly to the President to sign.

People who are longing for peace being told that Yeltsin "does not accept the idea of accord". A tried and tested device: use seemingly ordinary terms, but fill them with dubious meaning. We are asked to take our place "on one side of the barricades", but only one side has opened fire. They say one thing but do something quite different. First Tbilisi, then Baku and other hot spots and, lastly, the Baltics.

It is possible to agree without much thought until the foundations of the system and hence the main interests of the ruling community are threatened. They interpret civic accord as obedience to their will. However, the democrats must be criticized for their complacency, since they did not foresee the current counter-attack by reactionaries. They were aware, of course, that a deadly game has begun, but most of them failed to understand that it was more than just a game.

Yeltsin is closely linked to the radical democratic movement, especially in Russia. He was snatched by this movement from among the top party bureaucracy. He found support, and was advanced anew to a position of authority. You would have to be blind not to see the parallel between the permanent anti-Yeltsin campaign in the official mass media and the general war fought by totalitarian forces against the democrats.

Governmental propaganda deliberately did not go any farther than deadpan assertions, like the one that disorder was explaned by the lack of order, and mounting chaos—by presence of chaos. Such "incisive" analysis is not simply an example of thoughtlessness, but a justification of the use of force. To the accompaniment of propaganda of this sort, a salvo of presidential decrees was fired, boiling down essentially to a simle maxim: "Long live the man with a gun." The country is being turned into a garrison, the Kremlin Tower into a watch tower, the criminal code into army regulations.

The trouble is that retrenchment also has its own logic: if the real advance towards the market is foiled, a reverse movement commences—back to a command regime. Society, however, is told all the time that this artificially imposed dependence on force is the fruit of some supreme wisdom. That the short cut to the market actually requires the militarization of the economy, while the road to freedom is paved with dictatorship. In fact, our supreme authority has simply ceased reckoning with society. We can speak and write, ask and demand to our heart's content, but the authorities seem to be deaf in both ears.

No matter how many contradictions we may have inherited from the past, this fundamental contradiction stems from perestroyka itself. The full development of economic and political democrcay would amount to nothing more than renunciation of the existing state and social system, conversely, any attempt to keep it intact is tantamount to the renunciation of real democracy. This is the trap in which Gorbachev finds himself. The initial self-deception of the initiator of perestroyka has compelled him to resort to numerous manoeuvres aimed at somehow overcoming the logic of life and outwitting objective reality. But in such conditions it's simply impossible to find the "golden mean" and survive the looming contradiction.

The democrats have been blamed for subscribing to the rule: "The worse the better", which ex ante is always condemned as destructive. (This formula is used by those very guardians against the democrats: "The worse for democrats the better".) But then, of course, what's bad for your enemy is good for you. In fact, the worse it is for this faltering regime, a regime that is the source of many tragedies, the better it is for society.

As usual, the nation's Supreme Soviet has passed a special Resolution, declaring that Yeltsin's statement has produced an "emergency situation" in the country. But what, one may ask, did he say that most people's didn't already know? That millions of people have not seen with their own eyes and figured out for themselves? What Yeltsin said on TV is discussed in every corner. The problem is that **he said it openly.** Not in a narrow circle but for the whole country to hear. That's the whole meaning of the emergency situation. In the final analysis, people's deputy Boris Yeltsin exercised the right to address his electorate without permission from any body of authority.

Gorbachev-style consolidation is really deliberately slurred-over contradiction. Yeltsin-style confrontation is contradiction openly brought to light. And once it has been exposed, the question of political responsibilty arises. Both leaders must be held responsible for their

actions and called to account for their complicity in these actions. Yeltsin, we are told, was frightened by his falling rating among the electorate and, therefore, attacked the President. But ratings are no more than a thermometer. What's causing the mercury to rise? Isn't it because the structures of the central authority go to every length to limit the possibilities of Russia's leaders to fulfil their duty to the people, and to live up to the hopes and trust of the people of Russia? Isn't there reason to feel worried when you are being pushed into a moral and political cesspool? The Centre refuses to understand how it has hamstrung those who beleived in renewal and tried to do something about it.

Supreme Soviet's Limited Powers Noted

PM1403162091 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 9, 3-10 Mar 91 p 8

[Academician Oleg Bogomolov article: "The Burden of Half-Power"]

[Text] **According to the findings of an opinion poll in Moscow, less than a third of the electorate is satisfied with the performance of Russia's Congress and parliament.**

Many problems of Russia's parliament stem from the fact that its real power has been limited by the centre on the basis of the Constitution now in force and several other laws and acts of the all-Union authorities. Republican sovereignty is still a myth. Moreover, the electorate is losing faith not only in the Republic's structures but in the head of Russia's parliament.

Little wonder. After all, actual power has never been yielded by the party and state-bureaucratic apparat to democratic bodies, and Russia's parliament does not control the whole of Russia's territory. As before, it takes no part in major decision-making. Yet responsibility is shifted onto the democrats. People's disillusionment and disbelief are also being fuelled by the biased press coverage of the work done by the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet. Russia's provinces, denied the chance to watch the debates on TV, get distorted information. This also tends to limit parliament's real power. After all, in such difficult times, moral influence is as important as the actual mechanisms of executive authority.

The continuing battle over legal authority does not nurture trust either. What is to be done if the Centre continues to deny Russia's legal authority? The constitutional forms of struggle for sovereignty have by no means been depleted. They may be complemented by agreements now being reached between the Republics. The Council of the Federation can already be used for championing the rights of Russia and the other Republics.

The traps laid by the Centre or the tactic of forced compromise. The "Alliance of Four" will most likely materialize.... It stands to reason that it is the latter that the conservative forces at the Centre dread the most. Therefore it has shown no delight at all in responding to the possibility of concluding an "Alliance of Four". It is not accidental that our semi-official press has so strongly emphasized Nursultan Nazarbayev's declaration in Kazakhstan's parliament to the effect that there was no need to set up any "parallel centres". However, despite selective quoting from this document, it does not deny Republics the possibility of negotiating among themselves, and looking for an acceptable compromise with the Centre. Though, of course, compromises should not be seen as concessions solely on the part of the Republics or democratic forces. The other side should stop trying to impose its will by force and display a readiness to look for solutions on the basis of political dialogue.

At a recent meeting with Boris Yeltsin the leaders of the Democratic Russia movement said with concern that both Russia's parliament and government were falling into the traps laid by the Centre, i.e., the exchange of money. Yeltsin's defiance of the Centre, which made him so popular, appears to be weakening. If he behaves like an intractable child, but is later unable to stick to his guns, and is forced to retreat and accept the rules of the game imposed on him, his prestige is bound to decline. However, you can only afford to engage in fault-finding on every occasion when in opposition, without any real power. Parliament's work would have been paralyzed without some compromises.

As to Yeltsin's conduct in the Baltic crisis, he was absolutely correct. His address at the most dramatic moment to the Russian-speaking population and to soldiers played a major role in preventing the number of casualties from growing.

The rightists attack the head of Russia's parliament. The democrats stand up for the ideas of directly electing Russia's President. Who will win?

In spite of the unrestrained baiting campaign in the party press, the head of Russia's parliament must keep cool, for any error will trigger a storm of fresh attacks. Take, for example, his statement about the Army. Although there was not one word about forming a Russian army, Yeltsin's unclearly formulated statement gave rise to different interpretations, making it possible to discredit Russia's parliament and Yeltsin in the eyes of the army and its officer corps. Something similar also occurred with regards Russia's financial independence. They got the budget they wanted. But on the other hand, they also were forced to accept responsibility for the price increases, since the budget was already based on new, higher prices. At the most tense moment the Centre got an excellent opportunity to shift onto Russia the whole responsibility for the Centre's prices. Yet we have already seen what happened when Lithuania did the inevitable: raising prices led to the resignation of kazimiera Prunskiene and her Cabinet.

The attacks on Yeltsin have compounded the work of parliament. But both covert and overt attempts to force the resignation and re- election of Russia's parliament (it

is an open secret that communists are gathering signatures for Yeltsin's impeachment) will fail—the voters are sick and tired of political infighting. They certainly will not vote for the likes of the Russian Communist Party. An artificial parliamentary crisis can only lead to another spiral of instability.

The idea of directly electing Russia's President form a field of candidates is more justified (and popular). If we want to have a strong, effective and fair government, it is imperative that it should have a mandate confirmed by the whole people.

Reportage on Russian CP Joint Plenum Session

Polozkov Addresses Plenum

PM0803133091 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 7 Mar 91 Single Edition pp 1-3

[Report delivered by I.K. Polozkov, first secretary of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Communist Party Central Committee, CP CC, at the joint plenum of the RSFSR CP CC and the Central Control Commission on 6 March: "On the Communists' Tasks in Stabilizing the Sociopolitical Situation in the Republic"]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades!

Politically, we are running out of time. No more time must be wasted on debating and maneuvering. It is important to grasp this fact, and to discuss our Communist Party's tasks in the light of the situation that has arisen. I call on everyone to show the utmost constructiveness.

I. Cast Away Illusion, Face Up to Reality

For more than a year now we have been saying that the country is slipping toward disaster, and apparently we have begun to get used to the idea. But what have we done in that time? What do people hear from us, apart from reports of faits accomplis?

Let us admit it—if disaster has not yet happened, we cannot take much credit for it. The country is holding its ground on the brink of the abyss only thanks to the tremendous durability built into our socialist system and the people's fortitude, common sense, and patriotism.

What about the party, which still calls itself the vanguard of society? Why is it so helplessly surrendering one position after another? I think the time has come to say frankly and honestly that in recent years the CPSU has allowed itself to be excluded from the formulation of state decisions of the most fundamental importance, and has lost the initiative, surrendering it to other forces. As you know, a vanguard is characterized by a high level of discipline and unity of objectives and actions, yet in our ranks disagreements and vacillations continue. A vanguard does not bury its head in the sand, yet we have not yet done away with reassuring illusions and endless meaningless speeches. A ruling party should know how to keep ahead of events, yet we are falling increasingly behind. As a result we are faced with two realities: a split in society, which is no less dangerous than nuclear weapons, and acute dissatisfaction with the state and political leadership, which has reached a danger point.

But one cannot fail to see that the dissatisfaction, although it has become the common denominator of the mass mood, is very varied in its nature. Some people are worried that the country is disintegrating, others are opposed to any attempts to resist that disintegration. Some favor centralism, others are fundamentally opposed to any regulation of public affairs. Some favor order, others push vigorously for anarchy and permissiveness. Our opponents' aim is obvious—to intensify this dissatisfaction as much as possible, channel it into a single stream, disband the soviets, throw out the country's leadership and the USSR president, and remove our party from the political arena. Therefore we must act on the basis of these realities.

The correlation of forces, for all their diverse and interwoven nature, is simple enough. Basically the opposition, following a scenario from outside, is trying to create a second political center. That center is beginning to claim the right to dictate its will to the state leadership and all the republics. To that end it is trying to create a broad front of forces that support it—from national separatists to neofascists, from the lumpen to the soviet bourgeois.

In this connection I wish to say: On our political stage today, three forces stand out quite clearly.

On the right flank—reactionary circles calling themselves "democrats" or "left radicals." These are the people who want to replace perestroyka and turn it into a process of "creation" of a system that is completely alien to us. The people who are ruining our economy and cultures, subjecting the people to moral terrorism and humiliation, and perverting their historical memory. These people have formed a close alliance with the shadow economy dealers and the corrupt top layer of the state and economic apparatus, and they are supported by influential foreign circles.

In the center—forces that consistently advocate the socialist choice and the country's radical renewal on the basis of preserving and augmenting the economic, political, and cultural assets already created. The RSFSR Communist Party is the nucleus of these forces.

The right call us conservatives, investing that word with a purely negative meaning. But the real content of conservatism, if you take the scholarly definition of it, is the preservation and maintenance of the fundamental principles of state and public life—first and foremost the moral and legal principles. In this sense we are conservatives, and let us not be ashamed of that word.

Then why is our party subjected to such acute attacks? What have we done?

It is easy to answer that, if you remember that they started criticizing us—maliciously and brazenly—even before we came into existence. They criticized the very idea of an autonomous Russian Communist Party before they knew anything about its goals or its Action Program.

They were afraid that Russia would have its own party capable of fighting consistently for the true rebirth and revival of its people. They were afraid that we would staunchly defend the ideals and traditions of the people of Russia, their socialist choice.

But not only that. We are the most influential political force in the republic, enjoying wide support among the masses. The anticommunists will not achieve their goals while such a party stands in their path.

We are not prone to vacillation, we do not swim with the tide, and we do not hurry to arm ourselves with the latest fashionable pseudoinnovative theories and concepts.

There is one more force on today's political map, which the right-wingers at the Congress of People's Deputies have mockingly baptized the "black colonels." These are honest people, dedicated to socialism and their motherland, who feel the economic and political upheavals deeply and react keenly to the reactionaries' brazen actions. A force where emotion often takes the upper hand.

Incidentally, E.A. Shevardnadze recently spoke about these three forces. His analysis does, however, contain one point that I cannot agree with. He thinks that everything will depend on whom the conservatives align themselves with. No, if by the conservatives he means us, we ourselves choose our allies. Naturally, we feel closer to those who are to the left of us.

The hour of decision has struck for the country and people. It is characterized, in our view, by the following circumstances.

First. The antipresidential and antiparty bloc that has formed is in practice operating as an openly antistate bloc, stopping at nothing to break up the Union. Whereas only recently a distinction was made between the CPSU and the RSFSR Communist Party, Gorbachev and Polozkov, "good" Communists and "bad" Communists, reformers and conservatives, now it is clear that these are yesterday's games. It was nothing but a smoke screen. Incidentally, we were warning the central leadership about this long ago.

Second. Society is worn out by the prevailing chaos and confusion. Many people are in a state of confusion and trust no one and nothing. The destructive itch of extremism has surfaced again. This frightens people. They want stability. Clearly it must be restored without fail. Otherwise a dictatorship could indeed be necessary.

Third. Our opponents are increasingly frequently casting off their democratic clothing and masks as worn-out garbage, and pushing the country directly toward a "new order."

But you can only impose a "new order" on the Soviet people by digging up the established roots of economic and political structures that ensure society's unity and stability. Gavriil Popov, for instance, proposes a triad—"defederalization" of the state, "desovietization" of power, and "denationalization" of the economy. Well aware that this is not easy to implement, he has not the least hesitation in demanding that this "perestroyka" be imposed on our society by an iron hand, from outside. Yes, from outside, no less. Is not this the root of the pseudodemocrats' pathological hatred of the Soviet Army, the KGB, and other state structures?

The nature of recent events forces us to conclude that our recent assessment of the situation as a confrontation between the advocates of the socialist choice and the restoration of capitalism, while remaining true on the whole, no longer fully expresses the essence of the present moment. We must recognize profoundly for ourselves, and explain it and din it into the minds and hearts of every citizen, that what is at stake is the fate of the fatherland and whether its 1,000-year history will continue.

A great world power is on the dividing line between existence and nonexistence. They want to dismember the country and turn it into a few dozen semicolonies, raw material tributaries of economically developed states, a supplier of cheap manpower. Those who have an interest in such a course of events could not care less what flag it happens under—red, tricolor, or brown.

Our priority task is to expose the essential nature and operating mechanism of the antipopular, antistate forces that were long concealed behind the masks of democrats. Their political face can be clearly glimpsed when they play the card of so-called economic aid, while doing nothing to stabilize the situation in their own regions. This is particularly plain to see in Moscow and Leningrad. They are trying to convince the business world and statesmen that they should not be dealing with Gorbachev and the Soviet Government.

The cynicism of our elected "foremen" when it comes to choosing partners is also striking. The ANT affair, the 140-billion ruble [R] adventure, and others offer more than eloquent illustrations. Their unseemly proximity to the special services dumbfounds even worldly wise businessmen, while the Western media expresses concern that the "democratic" powers are thus compromising themselves.

What is the price of the endless foreign trips at other people's expense, which, in the language of all democracies, is called foreign lobbying and is punishable under criminal law. There are too many specific examples to

ignore this topic. The working people are asking increasingly frequently: Are our state, government, and Constitutional Oversight Committee capable, and is everyone ultimately really equal before the law? Communist deputies should be more active in raising questions like this in the relevant commissions of the USSR and RSFSR Supreme Soviets, and ensuring that they are considered.

We should also debunk the myth that the country's best minds, its intellect, are concentrated in the "democrats'" camp. A good many of the leaders of this aggressive, tightly knit grouping acted as theorists and troubadours singing the praises of the age of voluntarism and later stagnation. Now they have changed their shape yet again. With the help of tactics and methods drawn from the arsenal of Western propaganda, of which they have a good mastery, they now spit on what only yesterday they were calling on the people to believe in.

These "citizens of the world," through the mass media that they control, have brought into our land, in the guise of common human values, ideas and cultural achievements that are by no means the world's highest such achievements. Their aim is to spiritually corrupt the Soviet person, deprive him of national pride and dignity, and turn him into a slave to mass culture. And now everyone can clearly see their passion for rallies and the whipping up of hysteria and their fondness for all kinds of theatrical props, even going so far as to turn the lawmaking process into a well-orchestrated television show.

This technique of manipulating public opinion is passed off as freedom of the press and debate, and information terrorism is passed off as activity for the sake of humanism. By such methods they seek to instill into the people the idea that the loss of all social gains is a good thing, while plundering national assets and selling them off for a song are the great virtues of entrepreneurship. That a military police state, which is basically revived in the draft new Russian Constitution, is the ultimate in democracy.

It should be clearly recognized that antistate forces have set themselves and are consistently implementing the specific task of a counterrevolutionary coup, first in people's heads, and then in the entire structure of life. It is incumbent on us to base our activity on this undoubted fact.

What are the social base and motive forces of this ruinous, destructive process? A general outline of them can be provided by identifying those who stand to gain from everything that is happening. The dismemberment of the Union and of Russia is advantageous first and foremost to transnational corporations, which are engaged in a fierce struggle for the world's natural resources. It is advantageous to national separatist movements, which hope to satisfy their own selfish interests, but in fact act as instruments in the hands of those same corporations. Lastly, it is advantageous to our mafia—an alliance of the shadow economy and the corrupt bureaucracy. These two parasitic social strata, which have taken root in our society, are notable for having the voracious appetite of a young bird of prey and a total lack of any creative aspiration or potential.

We should not be misled by the fact that the two parasites not infrequently squabble desperately among themselves for a better place in the sun. Their fundamental aims are united, but it is important to them to represent their infighting as an important component of the "renewal process," and to impose on the people a false choice between fundamentally flawed alternatives, and it was for this purpose that the graphic labels "apparatus" perestroyka and "democratic" perestroyka were invented.

I have already spoken about the fact that a kind of "two-party system" is operating here, to divert public attention from the real problems. I repeat, the greatest danger that lies in wait for the truly patriotic, people's forces is the danger of being drawn into the struggle between these two octopuses, losing our autonomy, and becoming blind weapons in their hands.

It is becoming increasingly clear to people that today the main contradiction is between the working people and a bourgeois-bureaucratic grouping that is prepared frankly to betray national interests. This is truly a class contradiction. And it is not a question of avoiding a class struggle, but of preventing it from taking extreme forms and becoming civil war. That is still possible. A broad alliance of all healthy forces to save the Motherland is needed. There is no doubt that the vast majority of the people will be on its side, on the basis of their own objective interests. The recent conference of Russia's patriotic forces once again convinced us all clearly of that.

The broad masses have now begun to see the light. They are beginning to realize that much-publicized, enticing slogans are one thing, and real action is another. There is a growing sense of bitter disappointment in the pseudodemocrats who have come to power in many places—and at the same time a demand for a clear strategy for finding a way out of the crisis.

We Communists do not consider it necessary to conceal our principled views and positions. We are still supporters of socialist development and the unity and cohesion of our great, multinational country. Socialism has demonstrated that it is capable of standing its ground even in what looks like the most hopeless situation. We are convinced that only on this path can all the urgent problems be resolved.

But a different solution is being imposed on society: to forget the "utopias" and return to the path we were following before October.

But, first, you have to be naive to believe the fairy stories about the prosperity and opulence that prevailed in

pre-October Russia. If that had been so, the masses would not have risen in revolution three times in 15 years.

Second, if we try to return to that path now, we will find ourselves not with Swedish capitalism, but with a primitive, savage form of capitalism, dominated by a criminal bourgeoisie.

Last, it is worth thinking about the price of this return. Russia has become indissolubly linked with the collectivist idea of social justice, solidarity, and comradeship. They are inborn in it, and it cannot survive a break on such a scale.

The tasks of saving the country and saving socialism merge into a single whole. That is why we must raise aloft the banner of nationhood, statehood, and patriotism, and rally to this banner all healthy, truly democratic forces, all in whom conscience still lives and the sense of civic duty is not yet lost, irrespective of their political convictions, faith, or nationality. We are the heirs and rightful inheritors not only of seven decades of postrevolutionary development, but of a great power with 1,000 years of history.

The RSFSR Communist Party initiated the movement "For a Great, United Russia." We are open to dialogue and cooperation with all who care about the future of the fatherland. We are guided by this in constructing our political line. We do not consider the cause of perestroyka a lost cause, but the most important thing today is to secure stability, the normal functioning of a united state, its security, and the preservation of all the citizens' dignity.

II. Strengthen the Party and Move Forward to Resolute Actions

Comrades! People in the localities constantly ask: What specifically should be done in this complex situation, how should the raykom [rayon party committee], gorkom [city party committee], or obkom [oblast party committee] behave, how should the primary party organization and every individual Communist act? These are truly burning questions. We have seen this in our tours of Russia. But we cannot give a clear answer to them until we have defined the CPSU's role and place in society today.

In recent years a terrible pattern has become fully apparent—our good intentions and initiatives prove to be counterproductive. This is happening with democratization and glasnost, the rule-of-law state and freedom of the individual, the full power of the soviets and national rebirth. The ultimate question is: Why have hopes of dynamic economic and spiritual development turned to ruin and degeneration?

Until recently many people thought it was a question of not having a sufficiently well-thought-out plan for perestroyka, that we had set about implementing changes in too many areas at once. Clearly even this was not the whole story. But, looking back on the past years, you cannot help thinking: Did not the program of renewal cunningly conceal another program, which, as time went on, increasingly distorted the intentions of perestroyka as a renewal of socialism and turned it in a fundamentally different direction?

We recently saw the third anniversary of the CPSU Central Committee plenum at which it was proclaimed clearly that the main intention of perestroyka is to uncover socialism's potential by involving all the people's forces. A fine formula. Only its second part was later discarded. Highly complex reforms were implemented without drawing on the support of the party, the institutions of state administration, the labor collectives, the organizers of production, and the best intellectual forces, which are plentiful among the people. Perestroyka was monopolized by a small group of armchair radical politicians who cleverly manipulated the public awareness. They promulgated their own views in the party's name.

Those who designed the model of pseudoperestroyka realized, of course, that the path to such a "civilization" will inevitably lead our society to disintegration, ruin, and impoverishment. The intention, to all appearances, was to bring the country to the critical point of social upheavals under the nominal leadership of the CPSU and a Communist president, and then hold them responsible. While those who even now are actually in control of this process plan to assume the role of saviors and avenging angels.

But many people are beginning to grasp the full perfidiousness of what is happening. I think people are not far from the truth when they compare the present moment with the Time of Troubles and speak about new False Dmitriys astride Trojan horses. But whereas the False Dmitriys of past times knew very well that they were imposters and the tools of foreign kings, today's variety do not admit it.

We cannot and will not take the responsibility for the actions of the new pseudodemocratic authorities. But we have no moral right simply to observe dispassionately everything that is happening. We cannot, like our opponents, be guided by the vile principle "the worse things get, the better," and wait for the masses to check out through tragic experience the true aims of the anticommunists.

Today the situation is such that only action, changing the situation for the better, can prove us right. Despite the crisis and the losses, the party remains a powerful, organized, pivotal structure. There is no other such force in society. We must break out of our immobility and be guided not by formal considerations, but by the interests of the people and state, and not fear accusations that the party is again taking on improper functions. Let us be frank, hesitation is not only inappropriate here, it is criminal. Away with doubts!

If the new power structures have not yet established themselves, if they cannot or, worse, will not get down to business, then the party organizations and their committees must take charge of it. It is not a question of returning to the old methods. The times when everything could be done by diktat have gone. Today Communists should act only on the strength of democracy, the masses' support, and the correctness of their ideas.

Hence the most important task—to regain the working people's trust and strengthen the party's social base. First and foremost, to go to the workers' collectives—they were and are our foundation.

The development of the workers' movement in various forms demands that we cooperate closely with it and carry out profound studies, analyses, and forecasts. Unfortunately the CPSU has underestimated this movement. But the party that represents the working class' interests must be with that movement, at its head.

We must also acknowledge self-critically that we have not paid due attention to the new processes taking place among the peasantry, although here our ties are better, and among the intelligentsia and young people. That as a result an exodus from our ranks has begun. Last year a total of 1.28 million people left the republic party organization. Kemerovo, Sverdlovsk, Tyumen, and certain other oblast organizations lost one in five Communists.

It is clear that, on the one hand, a purging process is under way, and we will not miss the trimmers and careerists, of whom there are many among those who have left. But let us not close our eyes to the fact that a considerable proportion of active Communists, especially workers, have left the party. Here the factors are more complex, and they must be studied thoroughly.

A study of these matters in the Cherepovets Metallurgical Combine party organization showed that the majority of those leaving the party could not withstand the moral and psychological pressure, the accusations that Communists were responsible for all the outrages of past years. But there were also many who had lost their faith in the capacity of the CPSU leadership and local party committees to change the state of affairs for the better and defend the Communist's rights.

There are grounds for this. In recent years a great many decisions and documents have been adopted in which there is no concrete mechanism for implementation and no personal responsibility. The program statement "Toward a Humane, Democratic Socialism" was also guilty of this. How could we confine ourselves to a declaration of fine principles, when the question of the danger of counterrevolution, refugees, and bloody interethnic conflicts was already on the agenda?

This mistake cannot be allowed to be repeated when it comes to drafting the new CPSU Program. What Communists and all the people need is not abstract pictures of the future, but a real program of action, including a detailed study of the way out of the present crisis. We need a program with which we can win the elections to the soviets and, through the soviets, put it into practice. We would like to ask all members of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission to join actively in the crucial work of preparing the draft party program.

People are tired of promises and verbiage. The CPSU's prestige today is directly dependent on the effectiveness of its members, and is inconceivable without strong internal discipline. Here, Comrades, we have sustained the heaviest losses and become amorphous, and this must be tackled. Complete freedom of opinion in discussing the tasks that arise, attentiveness toward each other's arguments, and the mobilization of all forces to fulfill the decisions adopted—that is the basis of the party's existence as a militant, effective organization. Otherwise it becomes a "debating society" incapable of adopting effective decisions, still less implementing them. So let us not be like the well-known heroes of Krylov's fable [in which the pike, swan, and crayfish try to shift a cart, but fail because they are all pulling in different directions], because our "cart" is too precious: It is the future of the fatherland and of an effective CPSU, it is people's prosperity.

The main danger confronting the party today is the increased activity of right-wing forces within the CPSU. On the eve of our founding congress they were already making purposeful efforts to make us deviate from our strategic line, dissipate our will in a cloud of pseudodemocratic talk, and bring about the degeneration of the party. One has the impression that those who slammed the door acted more honorably than those who stayed in the CPSU solely for this purpose.

It was the right who skillfully divorced the party from the mass media. Their favorite method was that of constant, stunning blows against the so-called partocracy. They tirelessly organized campaigns at the Congresses and put on noisy propaganda shows at rallies. In many ways they succeeded, but they did not achieve their goals. The party stood firm, held its ground, and rallied again.

Realizing this, the so-called "Democratic Movement of Communists" inside the party changed its tactics. Now it is concentrating its efforts on forming an organized opposition within the party. They are coming together and coordinating their actions, and the group is taking on organizational shape. They are already writing their program documents. True, these lack even a social democratic content. They amount to a vague collection of pseudohumanist principles whose true meaning not everyone will immediately recognize.

The right's activity requires keen attention. The task of reviving the party and preserving its unity is the most important task.

We must urgently recommend to party organizations and their control organs that they pay attention to the strengthening of party discipline. Let us not conceal the fact that many Communists have stopped measuring

their actions against party decisions, still less implementing them. We should give every support to those party organizations that call such Communists fully to account. Yesterday the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission expelled S.N. Smirnov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Youth Affairs Committee, from the CPSU for actions incompatible with the CPSU Statutes. It was he who initiated the decision "On the Departyization of RSFSR Educational Establishments." This approach is shared and supported by many members of the Russian Communist Party.

III. Stabilization of the Economy—the Key Task of the Day

Comrades! The emergency situation in the republic is largely due to the collapse of economic management. The top authorities, having set themselves up in ambitious opposition to the Union center, have stopped tackling urgent economic problems in practice. Russia entered 1991 without a plan, a budget, or an effective government.

The decline in production that was allowed to occur last year is deepening. The extraction and production of the most important types of raw materials and food products, purchases of milk, meat, and eggs, and the commissioning of housing, schools, and preschool institutions have declined sharply.

The refusal to regulate economic ties and reliance on a blind, accelerated transition to the market led to anarchy, ruin, and a decline in living standards. Dozens of major cities and industrial centers are already failing to receive their allocations of food and consumer goods. The working people of the Urals, the North, the Far East, and Tyumen Oblast, where for several months goods have not been available even in exchange for coupons, are in a particularly grave situation.

The leaders of local soviets, concerns, associations, and enterprises, finding no support from the RSFSR Government, are resorting to large-scale bartering in the situation that has arisen. Commitments are broken and established economic links are severed. It is March, yet only 80 percent of delivery contracts have been concluded, and even then with no reliable guarantees.

It is becoming obvious that the administrative organs formed in the republic and their legal, organizational, and cadre backup do not meet the national economy's real needs. The Russian Supreme Soviet and Government were patently too quick to destroy the existing administrative structure before they had created a new one. This led to economic instability and numerous seats of social tension.

Easing this tension is an urgent task. At such a critical moment the party has no right passively to watch the collapse of the economy. People rightly reproach Communists for isolating themselves from economic work, and assess this as a serious error.

To be fair, I must say that this is not the situation everywhere. In the Kabardino-Balkar ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], Stavropol Kray, Belgorod, Orel, and Rostov Oblasts, and a number of other places, the party committees, together with the soviets and with the firm support of a body of economic leaders and specialists, have succeeded in ensuring the fairly efficient utilization of production potential, boosting the volume of production, and successfully assimilating the new economic mechanism. All this has enabled them to avoid a sharp decline in people's living standard.

On the subject of economic stabilization measures in the republic, we think it necessary to draw your attention to the following tasks.

The first thing that must be done is to restore the manageability of the national economy.

Through Communists who are people's deputies, we must achieve the restoration of the damaged structures for coordinating the activity of industrial enterprises and construction organizations. Until such time as a different system of economic management has been set up and run in, we will have to tackle day-to-day operational problems. There is no escaping this.

Party committees should show initiative in restoring economic ties. Their stabilization is a matter of life and death for the labor collectives. Unless we smooth out and restore these ties, stoppages of plants and factories, financial collapse, and all the ensuing consequences are inevitable.

First and foremost, party influence should be increased in collectives in the power industry, transportation, construction, communications, trade, municipal services, and the social sphere, which ensure the normal day-to-day rhythm of people's work and life. Party committees should be aware of current problems, help to resolve them, monitor the mood, and not hesitate to call Communist leaders to account. If these collectives start working steadily, the entire national economic complex will start working confidently.

Particular concern is caused today by the situation in the construction complex. This has been left unmanaged, and is disintegrating.

As you know, last year the social program was disrupted—the population failed to receive 400,000 apartments—and the commissioning of capacities slowed down in the processing industry, light industry, and basic sectors like the power industry, machine building, and oil recovery. We therefore appeal to the republic government and local soviet and party organs to take energetic steps to impose order in the construction complex.

The second thing is to boost consumer goods production in every way.

The most important thing here is once again to restore economic ties for deliveries of raw materials, semimanufactures, and subassemblies. Substantial benefits

should be created for all those who produce consumer goods, and unjustified restrictions on wage hikes should be lifted. In view of the crucial significance of state industrial enterprises and the kolkhoz and sovkhoz sector in meeting the needs of the population and the entire economy, they should be given priority treatment and the conditions should be created for their uninterrupted functioning. Efficient utilization of existing production capacities must be organized. Thus, while there is an acute shortage of consumer goods, construction capacities for the production of vacuum cleaners are only operating at 83 percent of capacity, those for television and radio sets are operating at 88 percent of capacity, and those for sewing machines at 71 percent of capacity.

In light industry and textiles, newly commissioned capacities using progressive manufacturing equipment are in general utilized to between 40 and 90 percent of capacity. As a result last year alone the national economy failed to receive light industry output worth R1.6 billion.

That is a current task. But in order to radically change the situation in the consumer market, the RSFSR Council of Ministers and local organs of power must consistently pursue a structural and investment policy of enhancing the role of group "B" in industry.

Everyone must clearly grasp that neither Russia nor our whole country will live on imports.

The efforts of labor collectives and Communists in the defense complex to build up production of consumer goods and equipment for their manufacture should be supported. They have done considerable work in the last three years. Extensive coproduction ties in which enterprises in all union republics take part have been established. The growth of consumer goods production is facilitated by conversion, the adoption of a law on which should be expedited.

Third, there is real concern for the countryside and the buildup of food production.

The situation is such that if organs of state management, industrial enterprises, and cities continue to avoid the extremely complex tasks of the agrarian sector, mass famine will become a reality in the current year. Above all, this is urgent for the major cities. Muscovites have felt on their own "backs" ["gorb"], so to speak, the full price of the Moscow City Soviet leaders' demagogic slogans and their refusal to take part in organizing the harvesting. The capital, like our other major cities, will scarcely last for long on foreign sandwiches.

At the same time, in a number of cities and oblasts where party influence is not weakening and where new forms of collaboration between city and countryside, between the working class and the peasantry, are being sought, a trend toward an increase in food resources is being maintained.

Party committees, with the participation of labor collectives and the social organizations concerned, must make an examination and help the soviets and economic managers to implement specific measures to complete the livestock wintering and carry out the spring field work. This must be regarded as the priority task whose implementation will decisively determine food supplies to the population this year and next. Farms must complete the repair of agricultural equipment in a timely fashion and be supplied with seeds, and the area sown to staple food crops must not be allowed to decline.

We regard it as advisable to return to programs of sponsorship assistance to the countryside everywhere. The experience of Voronezh, Lipetsk, and other cities attests to its great effectiveness.

At present preparations for the spring, provision with seeds, and the delivery and stockpiling of equipment, fertilizers, and fuel and lubricants are going considerably worse than in past years. But the volume of work this year is considerably heavier than in previous years. The program for the rebirth of the countryside has not been backed up.

Communist deputies must do everything to ensure that the government commission on food can provide the work of the agro-industrial complex in the spring period with everything necessary.

It is necessary to do as much as possible to help organs of state and economic management conclude contracts for 1991 for the purchase of agricultural output and the delivery of food to Union republic stocks.

In this connection I have to mention the "price gap" in agriculture. The discrepancy between the increase in prices for agricultural output and for material and technical resources for the countryside will place the overwhelming majority of kolkhozes and sovkhozes in a grave situation as early as this year. We appeal to the RSFSR Council of Ministers to return to the decisions of the Second Congress of People's Deputies and to take measures to avert the ruin of the countryside.

In our view, those are the priority tasks in stabilizing the economy. The most important thing is active, interested participation in th. perestroyka of production relations and the formation of new forms of economic management and ownership.

The question of power will also be decided on the basis of where this process leads and how it actually goes.

Our principled position is reflected in the Basic Guidelines. We are in favor of a transition to a mixed economy and to the creation of equal opportunities for the development of each of its components. But the question of tactics and methods of achieving this goal is not a matter of indifference to us.

But a section of the press is purposefully continuing to shape the opinion that the RSFSR Communist Party is a

force whose leadership consists of nothing but reactionaries and enemies of the market.

Clearly there is a need to speak out once again about this. Yes, we are convinced that the market will not enter our life overnight. Yes, we are implacable opponents, not of the market but of economic adventurism thinly disguised with the figleaf of market slogans. The experience of the East European countries which have advanced further than we have along this path shows that the promises of the "market sirens" are not being realized. National income is falling steadily, but at the same time the mechanism for redistributing it from the working people to neocapitalist strata is gathering momentum.

The situation is similar in our country. The programs for the switch to the market are aimed not at making rational use of the existing production potential and enhancing its efficiency but at redistributing what is still left. The result is this: 90 percent of joint ventures produce nothing, and labor productivity in many cooperatives is lower than in many workshops for invalids, but at the same time they are deriving the greatest advantage from this sort of "market" relations! We regard it as our duty to state that we will take no part in this deception of the people. Soviet people must be aware that a pilfering free-for-all is taking place under the flag of the market.

Today instead of the market we have a monstrous slew of ration cards, coupons, tickets, identity cards, and so forth—in other words, a purely administrative system for the distribution of practically all vital necessities which opens up truly boundless opportunities for abuses and a still greater strengthening of the real power of the bureaucracy and the shadow economy. It is they who are sabotaging any government measures to restore and stabilize the market—from attempts to make the growth in wages dependent on growth in labor productivity, to the exchange of large-denomination bills—by declaring them to be a return to the administrative edict system. Thus everything is being turned upside down. What our fashionable theoreticians naively take for a transition to market relations is essentially the continuation in another form of the pernicious practice of the time of stagnation and a lapse from a market regulated one way or another into primordial barter trade, economic chaos, and anarchy.

The situation today is just as absurd as it was yesterday. We are still proceeding not from the realities of life and real production relations but from dogmas produced by self-important men in the quiet of offices. It is just that the dogmas now relate not to the plan but to the market. Just as yesterday they would use the plan and total statization as the remedy for absolutely everything, today they are trying to use the market and total privatization as the remedy for absolutely everything. Nothing sensible will come of this.

Before it is too late we must critically review the vulgar everyday notion of the market that is dominant in society and overcome the pseudo-market euphoria as swiftly as possible. The market is a historically determined mode of economic functioning that takes various forms, and its potential is by no means unlimited. Economic practice shows that it is not a panacea for all the ills afflicting our economy. It is necessary to know how to use the market. There are sectors and spheres of the national economy where market relations are necessary and beneficial. These are primarily the spheres of small-scale and medium production dominated by enterprises poorly integrated by various cooperative ties. But there are spheres where the market "remedy" is downright disastrous, since it means for them nothing but the forcible rupture of long-standing firmly established intrasectorial and intersectorial ties, as we can see today.

Clearly, we should proceed from the premise that there is a need to reinforce the scientific plan principle wherever this is required, and in other cases there is a need to weaken or totally eliminate immediate directive regulation and to replace it by financial and credit levers.

In some cases there is a need to improve and strengthen state ownership, in others there is a need for equally resolute destatization, the creation of people's enterprises, and so forth.

Where and how we should act depends on the degree of technical and technological socialization of labor actually achieved at the moment in question in the specific sector. This must be scrupulously but urgently analyzed.

In our view, the main, pivotal idea around which the strategy of reviving a harmonious economic system should be formed must be that of accelerating scientific and technical progress and thereby enhancing social labor productivity. We must restore the scientific and technical intelligentsia's shaken confidence in our perestroyka and help to enhance its role and significance in society.

The conversion of defense production facilities is a matter of special attention. The way it is proceeding today testifies to the lack of real plans and ideas in this sphere. We cannot allow supremely skilled scientific, engineering and technical, and worker cadres to be misused and to switch from creating the world's best fighter aircraft to riveting together folding beds. It is the duty of party committees to defend and preserve these collectives.

A proposal that has long been put forward among sober economists is that a special "strategic echelon" of high-technology, science-intensive production units be singled out in the national economy, that it be provided with, so to speak, "most-favored status" by the state, and that its personnel be given material and moral incentives. The research and production structures of this echelon would be a source of new ideas, technologies, and cadres feeding the entire economy.

The objective need for such leading enterprises [lidery] is very great, but they are scattered among departments

and experience serious material and technical and financial difficulties. We are convinced that their artificial destatization and privatization will not help matters but only worsen the situation. Nowhere in the world have substantial scientific and technological breakthroughs been made in conditions of dissipation of efforts and resources and without firm centralized support and leadership. This is why we fully share the thought expressed by Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov that it is necessary to preserve the backbone of industry and provide it with incentives for development. Privatization must take place around powerful state "nuclei" and fill empty niches and pores.

This will constitute a mixed economy meeting the real needs of scientific and technical progress and the needs of the country as a whole. A scheme for the relations between the different components of that economy when large production facilities dominate has in fact long since been devised in the developed capitalist countries, where a whole system of contractors and subcontractors and of medium- and small firms has grown up around large corporations. It is precisely the most modern achievements that we should learn from the West, as Vladimir Ilich Lenin taught, rather than looking to its past—and not recent past, either.

Now a few words about privatization. An acute political struggle about this issue has now developed in the republic. The amendments to the constitution adopted by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and the laws on ownership, land, peasant (private) farms, and enterprises and entrepreneurial activity essentially impose only private ownership.

The draft "RSFSR Law on Privatization" makes an attempt to intensify the same line. The change in ownership relations fundamentally affects working people's socioeconomic rights and interests. But the draft assigns only a passive role to labor collectives. As a rule, they do not have the final say in choosing the form of destatization. Practically no place is found for the trade unions, either. The idea of exclusively private-ownership market-funded privatization is consistently pursued.

Russia's working people expect from Communists an honest answer to the question of how to ensure that the privatization of ownership does not result in a "capital" market where the working person with his income can do nothing.

We proceed from the premise that the working person, and the working person alone, must be the main, sole master in the market. We advocate the decisive right of labor collectives in shaping the new system of socioeconomic relations. It is very important for the position of the working class to be the determining factor in discussing and adopting final decisions on this score. If labor collectives defend their rights and interests even to the extent of going on strike, party committees clearly should not stand on the sidelines but be alongside working people to the end.

Russia's Communists support labor collectives' demands for the full economic possession of enterprises and the right of ownership of the results of their activity along with full economic responsibility for them.

The institution of self-management by labor collectives is the condition for the implementation of this demand. Party organizations must focus their attention on work in trade unions, workers committees, and labor collective councils, which must become a pillar of the economic reform and a school and guarantee of democracy and social protection for working people.

It has to be said that the process of privatization has now begun under pressure from the republic authorities. In a number of places it is proceeding by constraint, without consideration of labor collectives' interests and without their participation.

There have already been cases of collectives and individual citizens buying up enterprises and organizations without any inventory and valuation of property. The people's assets often pass into an owner's hands essentially for nothing. Thus, with the permission of the "Soyuzstroymaterialy" state association, the residual value of the Staryy Oskol Cement Plant, which is R60 million, has been artificially reduced to R16.2 million by means of various operations, and the plant has been leased at this value with the right of purchase over a 10-year period. Zealous privatizers are now threatening maternity homes, as in Samara, for instance, where they are intending to charge R1,000 per birth.

We believe that until the question of the stages, timetable, and methods for the privatization of ownership is decided and a mechanism for its legislative regulation has been adopted, this process should be halted. The RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat has officially sent a memorandum on this question to the country's president.

Land is a separate issue. Guided by the Basic Guidelines, party committees must firmly oppose the selling off of land and forcible decollectivization and ensure equal rights for all forms of economic activity in the countryside. We must actively participate in the work of committees on the land reform. Our negative attitude toward private ownership of land does not rule out the possibility of receiving truck gardens, dacha and garden plots, and so forth. I make a point of emphasizing this because our opponents constantly speculate on this.

I hope that Central Committee members will express their attitude toward the problem of privatization. A clear position on this question must be enshrined in the plenum's resolution.

Direct contracts between oblasts, krays, and republics for the delivery of materials for the needs of local industry and for the provision of various goods and food for the population are being concluded in a number of regions of Russia. These proceed from the premise that it is hard to resolve these questions via the center, and

Moscow cannot and must not decide these matters for the rayons. However, the idea of creating economic zones is not new. I think that Communist deputies should study this problem and speak out in the relevant bodies.

IV. Restoring Constitutional Order and the Effectiveness of the Soviets

Comrades! All efforts to stabilize the economy will come to naught if the destructive processes taking place in the political sphere are not stopped, if constitutional order is not imposed, and if the disintegration of the state is encouraged.

This depends to a considerable extent on how vigorously and fruitfully the soviets of people's deputies work. The process of the transfer of power by the party to the soviets has proved more complex and agonizing than was thought. It is now clear that this transfer cannot be a one-shot act but requires a number of stages. Where party committees were abruptly removed from power or voluntarily renounced it there emerged a vacuum which was rapidly filled by unworthy political elements. By no means the best traditions of bourgeois parliamentarianism have flourished luxuriantly. Certain soviets have become not working organs but talking shops, have become involved in a "war of laws," and have become mouthpieces for antisocialist forces.

It has to be admitted: As yet the party has done little to rectify the situation. Communists have elaborated neither strategy nor tactics for their activity in organs representing the people, have effectively debarred themselves from taking an active part in the election campaign, and have allowed their political opponents to seize the initiative and prevail in a number of soviets of key importance. And now we are agonizingly seeking forms of work in organs where the functions of power are largely embodied by professionals engaged in quasi-academic and quasi-journalistic activity. Workers, peasants, doctors, teachers, and engineers are scarcely represented in many soviets.

We must critically review our work in the soviets and totally renew its principles. A CPSU Central Committee plenum is going to be devoted to this. But what should be done right now?

Every party committee must learn the lessons of the last election campaign and conduct systematic work with deputies, demanding that they take specific action to fulfill voters' instructions and show respect for state and social institutions.

All of us people's deputies were elected not for the kind of perestroyka that is now under way.

We must create party factions in all soviets and organize collaboration between them and other deputies' groups. For instance, Communists have united in the RSFSR Supreme Soviet with like-minded people from the "Rossiya" and agrarian workers' groups, representatives of autonomous formations, and others and have now begun constructive lawmaking activity. The first small successes must be built upon. But this depends, first, on the cohesion of the Communists' factions and their discipline in implementing the collectively elaborated strategy and tactics. Second, on practical support for our deputies from party committees and on good-quality scientific consultation and other assistance. This must be a priority in our work.

But in assimilating methods of legislative activity we must not forget Lenin's thesis that the soviets are a higher form of democracy than parliamentarianism and must rely directly on the working people's masses in their activity.

Labor collective councils must become the primary cell of Soviet power, and labor collectives must become the primary electoral cell. That was how it was when the soviets emerged as working people's power, and that is how it should be now. Only thus will the soviets be able to become really effective structures. We must put forward an initiative to change the legislation on elections and secure a return to the territorial-production principle for nominations and representation within the soviets.

In conditions where the "democrats" are hatching schemes for eliminating the soviets, we must defend them as the organs of people's power most fully consonant with our country's sociocultural and ethnic diversity.

Comrades! On 17 March Russia's citizens will express their attitude toward the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. You know how much speculation surrounds this problem. Therefore our most important task is to explain to people the vital importance of the referendum's results.

Everyone must have a profound feeling that the disintegration of the Union would produce a tangle of insoluble problems and cause a wave of tragedies and conflicts that would spell state and national disaster. Our homeland is now facing a more formidable danger even than it did in 1941.

The USSR is a very great historical gain of the 20th century and became possible thanks to the collective activity of the Russian people and our country's other peoples over the course of many centuries. It is a unique multinational, political association that took shape in an evolutionary way. The existing balance of world forces depends on it in large measure. Certain lovers of pipe dreams are calling for a "return to the mainstream of civilization." But it is impossible not to see that the USSR is a development of the best traditions of statehood of its constituent peoples and in this capacity is one of the main centers of world civilization. Incidentally, our homeland's peoples have repeatedly proved to the world that they will spare no effort to save human civilization. Our conscience regarding the world is clear, and our services are obvious.

Today you can hear it said that Russia is great and bountiful and can survive perfectly well without the Union. That is a profound delusion. If the republic secedes from the Union, the problem of the millions of Russian and Russian-speaking people beyond its borders will be sharply exacerbated. When symbolic borders become real borders, they will be like a knife through the living body of the Russian ethnos and will inflict a wound that will never stop bleeding. Who needs that kind of sovereignty?

The leadership of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, which is actively aligning itself with the national separatists in the Baltic and other republics, is contemplating the fate of its compatriots with indifference. The system of bilateral treaties is rather a series of protocols of intent without specific mechanisms to implement them. With regard to the treaties with Latvia and Estonia it must bluntly be said: These are a betrayal of the interests of the Russian-speaking population. Can we calmly watch this?

For Communists there are no doubts—all the peoples need a renewed Union of equal republics, and Russia too needs it.

As you know, certain forces in the RSFSR Supreme Soviet were able to force through a decision on a referendum on the question of introducing the post of president in the republic. I think you are well aware of the purpose of this. This question was not openly raised at the extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies. Now a different attempt has been made. Psychologically it may work—after all, this institution has been introduced in other republics.

Opponents of the RSFSR Communist Party endeavor to prove that we are opposed to the institution of the presidency in Russia solely on the basis of narrow group ambitions and we are blocking the strengthening of RSFSR sovereignty.

I would like to recall that Russian Communists have always advocated sovereignty for Russia, indeed, they can be said to have been at the origin of this idea. But today we see a vital need to create a more effective political and economic mechanism for protecting the interests of the republic and all its citizens.

But we are against this leading to bipolarity on the Union scale, which would then logically bring about the creation of a multipolar structure instead of the Union. And this is precisely what the creation of the post of Russian president would mean, to judge by the draft RSFSR Constitution elaborated and now being finalized by O. Rumyantsev's group. Implementation of this project will lead to nothing except a deepening of the disastrous confrontation between the Union and our republic.

Comrades, the situation in the republic depends on increased attention by party committees to the sociocultural sphere.

Many people now see that the danger of the spiritual and moral disintegration of society is becoming real. Social sensors signal symptoms of this calamity everywhere that ignorance and obscurantism invade culture, moral purification runs up against immorality, and education is replaced by the corruption of consciousness. Unless we make our environment healthier we can scarcely speak of any positive changes in the near future. Together with all the best intellectual forces Communists must get down to specific action in the field of science, culture, and the people's education. Together with youth organizations, they must prepare a specific action program for the immediate future.

The activity of law enforcement organs and the provision of assistance to labor collectives in imposing order in production and everyday life, in strictly observing legal and moral norms, and in organizing effective control in trade and the consumption sphere must become a concern of ours. Today the question of legal education, essentially of a campaign against legal illiteracy, is acute, and the party's best forces must be involved in this important work, we must learn ourselves and help others.

In the cause of the spiritual purification of society and improvement of its health Russia's Communists are prepared to support initiatives and efforts from any quarter and to act together with all parties and movements.

Those who do not protect and defend their homeland's holy places are doomed to moral degeneration. The duty of every honest citizen today is to defend the name and cause of V.I. Lenin from frenzied attacks.

You would think it was impossible to fabricate more disgusting slander and concoct more loathsome filth than that which was poured upon Lenin by the White Guard and fascist scribblers in their time. But no, people who only yesterday held party cards are now enthusiastically competing with them. Well, it is the commonplace logic of traitors to spit upon those whom they are betraying.

Lenin and Leninism are part of the culture of all mankind. How pitiful those who are trying to jettison it from world civilization look. The people still remember the true image of Lenin, an image equally remote from malicious caricatures and official icons. People remember that it was Lenin who proposed and implemented the only possible program for saving Russia from the national catastrophe into which it had been plunged by its talentless rulers. It is no accident that it is precisely the ordinary people—workers, peasants, and honest members of the intelligentsia—who have today risen to defend the V.I. Lenin Museum from profanation and plunder. Voluntary social associations in defense of Lenin are now springing up throughout the country. Party organizations cannot remain on the sidelines in this noble cause—they must head it.

We call on Communists and all Soviet people to worthily mark the upcoming 121st anniversary of Lenin's birth and to turn that day into a day of remembrance of the great revolutionary and founder of our party and state.

So, Comrades, I will sum up once again the main tasks on which we must now focus our attention.

First. The success of all our work depends on restoring trust in the party among the people and strengthening its influence among the mass of working people. In order to do this we must do our utmost to help to strengthen the alliance of the working class, peasantry, and labor intelligentsia, join their organizations and movements, share their life, and uphold their interests and rights. We must conduct extensive explanatory work about what Communists are fighting and striving for.

Second. We must promote the unification of all patriotic forces advocating the rebirth of the homeland, its unity and integrity, and its well-being and prosperity. We must remember that the people need peace and bread above all. We must defend the USSR. We must strengthen the friendship among the country's fraternal peoples and struggle implacably against any manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism wherever they originate.

Third. We must stop the country's slide toward economic catastrophe. We must face up to the national economy's urgent problems and use all our prestige and influence to restore the destroyed economic ties between enterprises, republics, and regions of the country. We must struggle to ensure that the reform of economic relations and the transition to the market are implemented by the working people themselves and in the interests of working people.

Fourth. We must defend and consolidate the power of the soviets. We must not allow the soviets to be turned into a talking shop. We must seek to ensure via the Communists working in them that the soviets express and represent truly nationwide interests, overcome parochial tendencies, and end the war of laws and sovereignties.

I want to stress that success will depend on strengthening the party ranks, cleansing them of alien and unworthy people, and really ensuring the power of the party masses. Cohesion, voluntary comradely discipline based on ideological unity, creativity, and a questing approach must define the life and struggle of all our party organizations from bottom to top.

We are well aware of how difficult Communists' working conditions are today. Tremendous destructive work in the spiritual sphere has been carried out in recent years. The values that make the people precisely a people and not a mob have been defamed and spat upon.

We were proud of having accomplished a great revolution that exerted a colossal influence on mankind's development. Now we are told that this was a coup perpetrated by a handful of irresponsible conspirators.

We were proud of building socialism. Things were hard for us, but our struggle was inspired with lofty meaning. Now it is portrayed as an adventurist experiment.

We were proud of the great victory in the Patriotic War, which saved mankind from fascism. Now attempts are being made to put us on a par with fascism.

The great role of the Russian people has been defamed. Only yesterday they were spoken of as an "elder brother" who gave up everything he had to help others. Today they are called colonialists and occupiers. Our chief asset—the peoples' friendship—is mocked.

Patriotism—a great feeling—is blasphemously interpreted as the "last refuge of scoundrels."

Intoxicated by this obscurantism, some people may think that there is really nothing left of these values. But let us not judge from the scribblings of the yellow-brown press. The ideas of social justice, national pride, and patriotism are indestructible. So, Comrade Communists, let us work vigorously and purposefully, ever mindful of the historic destiny of our homeland, the greatness of our ideals, and the loftiness of our party's thoughts and goals.

Speeches in Plenum Debate Reported

91UN1052A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 Mar 91 First Edition p 3

[Conclusion of report by Yu. Nikolayev and I. Filimonov on speeches in the debate at the joint plenum of the Communist Party of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Central Committee and Central Control Commission: "Key Task of the Day"]

[Excerpts] Dear Comrades! Stabilization of the situation in the republic and in the country as a whole presupposes us finding the main link that, it having been grasped, might permit the entire chain of unsolved problems to be pulled, was how **N.S. Stolyarov, chairman of the Communist Party of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Central Control Commission**, began his speech. Only where is this link? In the sphere of policy or the economy, perhaps? Opinions differ. But what is obvious is that the inauspicious economy could undermine any policy. Everyone agrees on this conclusion, it seems.

The new round of economic initiative of our governing party must be well thought out. There is no doubt that there cannot be any in any way serious authoritative party unless it has an economic policy—scientifically substantiated, clear to the people, consistent and in keeping with their fundamental interests. For your information: Problems of the development of the economy, social ecology, mass well-being and so forth have always been and continue to be predominant at forums of overseas communist and socialist parties. We, however, have recently been preoccupied with other matters.

Mobilization tactics are insistently knocking at the door of our economic sphere. And this by no means signifies

general labor service or the strict command structure of management of the whole national economy of the model of the grim war years. No, we are talking about a process of the temporary, centralized presidential power of the restructuring of the exclusively state-run socioeconomic sector as the nucleus of the multistructural economy that has already actually taken shape.

I see mobilization tactics as an integral system. I emphasize, a system, of extraordinary measures of the authoritarian-centralized control and scientific regulation of the hidden potential and mechanisms of the state-run economy for the purpose of dynamism and efficiency being imparted to it. The contours of this system were outlined successfully, it seems to me, in the presentation of the Leningrad comrades, whose proposals I would like to support.

A mobilization economy has precedents in world practice also, particularly at pivotal stages of social development. It is essential to carefully perfect it, assigning political regulation a particular role here—regulation that expresses our real aspiration to a transition from directively planned production to a recommended planned mechanism taking account more or less flexibly of market conditions. But such a transition should be consistent, without spurts and jumps, revolutions and counterrevolutions. This is clear to everyone, it would seem: Endless struggle requires endless effort and expenditure of the energy of each active person so necessary for the cause of the recovery of economic life.

Having recognized the path of evolution, the path of peaceful restructuring, we need to master the greatest art of brinkmanship between freedom and unfreedom, of the convergence of political polarity. An acute, confrontational policy line is incapable of keeping any economy from collapse. The Communist Party today needs to think realistically, and it is vitally necessary that we master coalition strategy. But not according to the principle of pulling toward ourselves "our people" and only those inordinately close in spirit. The art of coalition is knowing how to agree on the subject of common actions in the sphere of economic life and social programs with those who do not share our ideological views. It was none other than Lenin who wrote: "We will support bourgeois democrats always when they struggle if only for slight progress." But we do not want to see in one another either great or slight progress. Combining forces for common useful action is absolutely essential. Coalition strategy and tactics would not, I believe, eliminate party particularity.

The restructuring processes are specially in need of intellect today. We regarded perestroyka itself, you will recall, as an intellectual breakthrough of society which began at some point in time. Under social conditions which have become more complicated it is very important to be imbued in a plenitude of political realism with the fact that there will be no coping without our intellectual fund, which is accused of all failures, unfortunately. Our scientists are our scientists. We will, alas, simply not find others who are better. The party must show its capacity for relying on the scientific potential of society.

Most acute criticism of the president and the general secretary has been heard here. Well, we have a right to criticize him, of course. But let us reflect, relying on the logic of Marxism here, on the dialectics of the objective and the subjective. What the leader of a governing party may do is dependent not on his wishes and desires but on the degree of development of material living conditions. This is an axiom of Marxism. That he, the leader, should do what his own party requires of him depends once again not only and not so much on him personally as on the conditions of political life. This is why the president and the leader of the governing party need political support, our support, comrade Communists. This is the first thing.

Second, transferring the heavy burden of responsibility onto one man or a collective body—the Central Committee—is what is easiest. But this signifies an attempt—free or involuntary—to lift responsibility from oneself and essentially to acknowledge one's own helplessness or inactivity. Neither is activity, even the most vigorous, for that matter, always a blessing for the party and it does not always contribute to a consolidation of its leading position. We have abandoned totalitarianism and claims to absolute truth and are asserting a pluralism of party opinions. But there is pluralism and pluralism. There are rational limits to the hubbub of voices also. There is, finally, a statutory framework of the faction approach. When the "Leningrad initiative" actively contributed to the formation of the Russian Communist Party, this was good, we understand, know and value this. When Comrade Tyulkin and I met side by side in the plant outfits of Yakutia and conducted a polemic, most acute at times, but did not differ on what was most important and essential, Yakutia's Communists expressed to us only words of gratitude. We did not hear anything else. But how are we to understand the pretensions to the organizational formalization of the "Leningrad initiative" and structures parallel to the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission? Does this contribute to a strengthening of the position of a party that is today so in need of unity? When "Yedinstvo," run by Nina Andreyeva, calls Gorbachev and his team to account, it shores up, regardless of its good intentions, the positions of the Russian leaders who are calling for a boycott of the central authorities and permissiveness asserted beneath the outwardly decorous call "take as much power as you can swallow."

And the final point. Democracy—truly the finest model of human community living—presupposes many things: discipline, responsibility, and culture of human relations. But when we display intolerance of one another and an incapacity for hearing and listening to one another, this is not democracy. Nor is it democracy or freedom when we permit members of parliament with a party card to speak contrary to the interests of the party and its political leader, for genuine freedom presupposes

moderation and a recognized need for action. And this is a rule for the whole civilized world. The French Socialist Party, for example, does not permit a deputy to speak contrary to the decision of the faction. And if he does, he is deprived both of his mandate and his party card. Only the president, by virtue of his moral and practical authority, has the right to his own opinion and is outside of the party contract. This is precisely what we are lacking, what could be called culture of parliamentary activity.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR Central Control Commission intends to help the Communists and the people's elect mold such a culture. Helping by example, good words, and advice. But where the disease is too far gone, we will apply a surgical scalpel. It was not an easy decision we had to make yesterday on the expulsion from the party of the Communist Smirnov, who, I am convinced, could under different, more stable conditions have realized his creative potential to the good of the party also. One feels sorry on the human level for the person who has gone astray, but he had made his choice. So did we for, truly, there was no further room to back down. [passage omitted]

I. Antonovich, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the RSFSR, shared his thoughts on how to find a way out of the current situation:

Almost all evaluations have been made and emphases arranged, but what is to be done is not that clear. Pessimistic assessments have been predominant in the course of our debate, for all that, but I will try to inject a slight note of optimism.

The situation is difficult, catastrophic, but not hopeless and not deadlocked. This is not how things are in history. We can affirm today a number of changes that have taken shape in intraparty life and in the attitude of the party toward society and society's attitude toward the party which testify that the period of torpidity caused by the powerful criticism of us, which has of late ascended to malicious slander, and the lack of real opportunities for influencing matters positively, is passing. Sociological studies testify that the majority of Communists intends to remain in the party. A figure—36 percent—for those intending to leave has been cited here. I do not know from which sources it was taken. We have different figures. Some 74 percent of the Communists have decided to remain in the party, come what may, and only 12 percent are still thinking it over. These are different dynamics.

Communists are beginning to understand that only the party is capable of extricating society from the state of crisis and to sense their responsibility in this connection. The stream of those joining the CPSU is, albeit very slowly, beginning to grow in a number of regions of the republic. Our ideological adversaries did not expect this, it seems. I think even that they are regretting that they were somewhat overhasty in moving toward direct confrontation with the CPSU, openly letting out of the bag their aim of replacing socialism with capitalism and declaring anticommunism their banner. This split society, intensified confrontation, and increased the extent of the social malice and intolerance, and the people have understood a great deal, all has been revealed to a large extent and it has become clear who's who. It is time for us to intelligently take advantage of this for a retaliatory response.

Of late there has been an intensification of the struggle of schools, thoughts, currents, and positions within the party also. This is in itself a positive phenomenon. But certain forms that cannot fail to greatly put us on our guard are emerging in the dissent movement. They were mentioned in the report. Interest in social democratic platforms and the organization of a social democratic faction is, as before, being pushed within the CPSU. Let us seek no enemies but facts. When Comrade Lipitskiy complains, incidentally, that with us any dissident is a CIA agent, the question arises: Is it not clear to him that there are agents of dissidence, for which the CIA pays? If he does not understand this situation, I do not understand how a member of the Communist Party of the RSFSR Central Committee can permit such naivete or lack of knowledgeability.

But let the agents be, let us return to the facts. You undoubtedly saw in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA the article by three authors: Alekseyev, chairman of the Constitutional Oversight Committee, Burlatskiy, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Stanislav Shatalin, mentioned earlier, former member of the Presidential Council, which was entitled "Alternative to the Comminution of the Forces of the Left—Movement Toward Social Democracy." Practically synchronized with this article, a statement of participants in a meeting of supporters of the democratic movement of communists of Moscow and Moscow Oblast, among the authors of which are Comrades Bezgulov, Buzgalin, Kalganov, Lipitskiy and others, members of the CPSU Central Committee and Communist Party of the RSFSR Central Committee, was disseminated in the party. The theoretical and ideopolitical views of the supporters of the two programs are blurred, but are largely common. It is a question, as before, of accentuation of the idea of the CPSU's responsibility for totalitarianism and the crimes of Stalinism, of an orientation toward some abstract humanitarian society in which everyone has it good, although it is not clear how, and of the arbitrary breakup of the intraparty structure into schools of orthodox Communists, liberals, reformers, centrists and others. The positions of the two approaches are united also in the conclusion that perestroyka has not eventuated with us nor could it have. The main thing that needs to be done now, therefore, is to unequivocally bring back private property and the market economy, not worrying whether this is capitalism or socialism because these concepts allegedly do little for an understanding of our world. The authors' ideal is social democracy, which they

characterize as the progress of society based on modern technology and inheriting and continuing the traditions of parliamentarianism and market relations.

Let us tell the truth: This is a highly embellished concept of social democracy as the highest achievement of Western civilization. It does not mesh entirely with the actual state of the social democratic movement in the world. It is time this was said. I would remind you that the social democratic movement is one of two parts of the world revolutionary process, which at the start of this century renounced struggle for the destruction of the foundations of capitalism, today declares Marxism utopian and is emphatically professing the abandonment of Leninism.

We would make a proviso concerning one obvious point that the authors of the rosy portrait of social democracy in the said document prefer to forget. Social democracy as a successful movement has revealed itself only in highly developed capitalist countries. It has experience of struggle with us, it does not have experience of cooperation. Today it also remains primarily deaf to our assurances of a desire for friendship. The social support of social democracy today are the worker aristocracy, the petty proprietors, shopkeepers, individual peasants, tenant farmers and the middleman strata and middle bourgeoisie of the service sphere. This is the heart of it. It is therefore the question of a social environment that is absent from our society. Consequently, a goal of the social democratic movement specified in the criticized documents is formation of the essential changes of the social structure. As we can see, the new movement is attempting to follow the same path as is now being followed by the anticommunist Democratic Russia. Also there is a complete rejection of reliance on the present social base, and the need to create a new stratum of owners—lessors and entrepreneurs—as the mainstay of the new authorities is declared a program principle.

If we collate the two schools, it transpires that both movements agree on one point: turning and transforming the present social structure of the socialist society in the USSR and converting it into some likeness, copy and cast, if you will, of modern capitalism. I agree that we are far removed from modern capitalism, but we do not need it either.

And what is proposed, what is more, is not gradual progress by way of reforms and slow transformations but a powerful break and abrupt change, that is, a strategy that to social democracy formerly was always alien. This would mean total renewal, which would cost us no less than our own revolution. An abrupt new change from the present unpropitious, but real situation to a murky utopia is being prepared.

Of course, all this needs to be considerably pondered and debated, without colleagues' feelings being hurt. And by seeking the truth by way of rational argument. But even now I would like to point to a situation that links the democratic movement within the CPSU to some extent with the attempt to organize a social democratic faction. Both would like to convert the CPSU into a parliamentary party, deprive it of the status of a mass-political organization and work mainly in parliaments.

In other words, to reduce all the CPSU's functions merely to one, to the legislative function. We would note that they make no mention here even of the soviets, as organs of the power of the people, and prefer to pontificate merely about the legislature, which does not exist either but which they are intending to create.

They propose cooperation in this legislature with all factions except the communist faction. The word "communist" generally is virtually absent from the documents of either the authors of the social democratic model or the authors of the democratic movement.

It is not that difficult to conclude that what is proposed is the organized formalization within the party of horizontal structures, which would destroy its social mainstay, basis and orientation and its communist-type character—party of all working people—and create on the basis thereof one or several parties, which would reject the socialist principle of the current movement.

It is necessary beneath any euphonious demagogy to be able to distinguish the goal. In this case this goal is not in doubt. There is a clear political danger for the party here, the more so in that a number of other schools of thought—such as the initiating movement of Communists of Russia, for example—also aspires to the creation of a permanent organizational structure. And whatever modest statements about the capacity for making forecasts are made here today, organizational structures are already in evidence. And it [as published] is contrary to the CPSU Statutes, and we need to react to them as antistatutory behavior.

It is high time we differentiated between the cataclysmic forecast and the possibilities of thinking about what to do. Our party finds itself under crisis conditions. And this is an illness. It is the illness of society also. Nonetheless, we Communists of Russia must do everything to avoid the party's disintegration into mutually exclusive horizontal structures.

Ours is a different task. Let us finally all unite, and the Communist Party Central Committee is making certain attempts in this respect. And I would like to mention the "For a Great, United Russia" conference, which we staged with the participation of more than 100 organizations. According to Comrade Protasenko, the conference motto was a White Guard slogan. But the White Guard did not, as you know, make a united and indivisible Russia in its image and likeness. We Communists restored it, and our task now is to preserve it and prevent it from being divided by the forces now opposed to us. White Guard utopianism ended in failure, but we must be successful.

The social democratic and democratic initiatives emerged in Leningrad and Moscow, and I would like to

emphasize this fact and call your attention to it. We are talking about a small group of party intellectuals who would like to plunge the party into a new debate and talking-shop and new organizational turnings. It is to this end that it is proposed to hold a special congress in 1991. Comrades, I know the different opinions, therefore permit me to cite just one small argument. This is my opinion. It is said that it needs to be convened to establish the new program. But there is no program as yet, and we have only just started work on it. Let us create the program and then agree on a time for the congress. Just ponder for a moment the preparatory work that needs to be done in connection with this congress. And also the amount of debate, which would distract us all from participation in actual work, and it would be clear that this would once again deprive the party for a long period of time of the capacity to act and would in fact confine the extent of its influence on society merely to parliamentary initiatives. This is so obvious that it is incomprehensible why there is dissent on this matter.

It is undoubtedly essential to perform strenuous theoretical work, encouraging the Communists' collective activity in respect to the creation of a new CPSU Program. An immense amount of work. For a trend in the party toward an impoverishment of its ideopolitical potential has emerged. And this is explained primarily by the inadequate theoretical activity of the party's theoretical organs. The reproaches leveled at the journal KOMMUNIST are justified and lingering, and I say this in the presence of esteemed members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee. A close study of the issues of KOMMUNIST for 1989, 1990, and 1991 testifies that the problems outlined by the 28th CPSU Congress virtually have not been raised there. A notable part of the articles has been written by the members of the editorial office themselves and represents a palette of topics that fit ill with the party's actual social and political problems.

An odd position has also been adopted by the journal DIALOG—the regular authors being merely representatives of the identified democratic movement. The editorial board generally displays exaggerated attention to the future leaders of the democratic movement. A recent issue presents a biography of one of these leaders in portraits and colors that—in respect to sugary-unctuous groveling—our party press would not have allowed itself even in the stagnation era. Nothing as yet indicates that these two journals could recover and take on theoretical work. I would therefore like today, not for the first time, to put to the CPSU Central Committee the question of the need to create under the auspices of the Communist Party of the RSFSR its own theoretical journal. Party thought in the party's research institutions has become frozen. Many of them prefer to conceal their party affiliation, disguising themselves under fashionable political science names, and some have rushed into the search for sponsors outside of party budgets, recent adversaries included. Party problems proper have disappeared here also. If this unrestricted search in the party's educational institutions and research centers continues beyond its requirements, the question will naturally arise: Can the party support such centers if they are working not for it but for all simultaneously?

Under the conditions of the anticommunist opposition to the party's policy and aims it is essential to dissociate ourselves from all who would like to unequivocally do away with the socialist nature of our system and return it to a state of capitalism. There are movements with which discussion is impossible. It is necessary despite everything here to do everything to retain the traditions of intellectual pluralism, dissent and the struggle of opinions already embedded in our life by the progress of perestroyka. We must say a decisive "no" to factionalism and the comminution of the party into eternally struggling wings, not forgetting here to support in every possible way that which is new: approaches, ideas, a positive struggle of opinions and a democratic process of intellectual renewal, which the party needs now, perhaps, more than ever. Words are not deeds, words are words. But it is good if they are heard.

To conclude the debate I.K. Polozkov, first secretary of the Communist Party of Russia Central Committee, answered numerous questions.

Information Report on Plenum

PM0803123191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 7 Mar 91 Single Edition p 1

["Information Report on Joint Plenum of RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission"]

[Text] A joint plenum of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission was held 6 March. Republic, kray, oblast, and okrug party committee first secretaries who are not part of the Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission, the cochairmen of the "Russian Communists" deputies group, rectors from higher party schools, workers from military-political organs, and journalists also took part in its work.

The following questions were discussed:
1. On Communists' tasks in the stabilization of the sociopolitical situation in the republic.
2. On the RSFSR Communist Party budget for 1991.
3. On an estimate of the expenditure of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission for 1991.
4. On the status of RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee members.
5. Appeal from the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission to the peoples of the Russian Federation.
6. On progress in the formation of RSFSR Communist Party mass media.

I.K. Polozkov, first secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, gave a report on the first question.

The following took part in the discussions: V.V. Yashin, second secretary of the Leningrad Party Obkom [Oblast Committee]; Z.I. Vasilyeva, teacher at Cheboksary's No. 27 High School; A.A. Kudryakov, first secretary of the Rybinsk Party Gorkom [City Committee]; V.A. Samorodskiy, first secretary of the Smolensk Party Obkom; A.Z. Nosov, grinder at the "Agregatnyy Zavod" production association in Saratov; B.D. Muyev, first secretary of the Kalmyk Republic Party Committee; O.Ye. Kirillov, writer; G.A. Gorbunov, first secretary of the Astrakhan Party Obkom; S.Ye. Korepanov, first secretary of the Yamalo-Nenets Okrug Party Committee; V.S. Lipitskiy, sector head at the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism; I.I. Nikulin, first secretary of the Novgorod Party Obkom; N.V. Bystrov, head of department at the Moscow Automobile and Highway Institute; I.M. Shabanov, first secretary of the Voronezh Party Obkom; N.A. Krasnov, chairman of the "Vernyy Put" kolkhoz in Semenovskiy Rayon, Nizhnyy Novgorod Oblast; V.M. Spirin, first secretary of Irkutsk Party Obkom; T.G. Avaliani, first secretary of Kiselevsk Party Gorkom, Kemerovo Oblast; V.A. Tyulkin, secretary of the Leningrad "Avangard" science and production association party committee; A.S. Demidov, plasterer and painter at the "Sakhalinneftestroy" trust; I.I. Antonovich, secretary of the RSFSR Communist Part Central Committee; N.P. Kiselev, chairman of the Kirov Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies; O.S. Shenin, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and V.V. Yelagin, first secretary of the RSFSR Lenin Communist Youth League Central Committee.

I.I. Antonovich, secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, spoke on the first question on behalf of the editorial commission. A resolution was adopted which will be published.

Having heard reports by I.M. Golovkov, Central Committee administrator of affairs, and P.Ya. Slezko, deputy chairman of the Central Control Commission, the plenum ratified the Communist Party budget and the estimate of RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission expenditure for 1991.

In connection with the upcoming USSR referendum, the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission adopted an appeal to the peoples of the Russian Federation.

The status of members of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee was ratified.

The plenum took into consideration information from G.A. Zyuganov, Central Committee secretary, on work on the formation of RSFSR Communist Party mass media. The Central Committee Secretariat was instructed to speed up the implementation of the scheduled program.

O.S. Shenin, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Yu.A. Prokofyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo; Yu.A. Manayenkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and Ye.N. Makhov, acting chairman of the CPSU Central Control Commission; participated in the work of the plenum.

SELSKAYA ZHIZN Report

91UN1057A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 9 Mar 91 p 2

[Article by Vladimir Markov at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Communist Party Central Committee press center: "Communists of Russia for Stabilization of the Society"]

[Text] In spite of the fact that it was the day before a holiday, on 7 March there were a lot of people in the CPSU Central Committee press center. The public interest in the political position and the affairs and plans of the Russian Communist Party is not waning but growing.

Soviet and foreign journalists at the press conference on the results of the joint plenum of the Central Committee and Central Audit Commission of the RSFSR Communist Party explained in detail which measures for stabilization of the economic and political situation in the country were proposed by the joint plenum and how they assess the course of the modern political struggle, the opponents' position, the alignment of social forces, and the possible results of the 17 March referendum.

Naturally, some of the questions came from representatives of the mass media, whose attitude toward the Communist Party of Russia is characterized by blatant negativism. Thus M. Deych [as transliterated], a correspondent of the infamous Radio Liberty, asked a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, First Secretary of the Communist Party of Russia Central Committee I.K. Polozkov:

"Not so long ago you spoke at a conference in the Hall of Columns along with the Social Patriots and the Pamyat Society. Was this your personal initiative or the line of the RSFSR Communist Party?"

Their intentions were simple: The uninformed or unthinking person will recall: That was a joint measure of Pamyat and the Russian Communists. In the first place, it compromises the Communist Party of Russia because it is assumed that "social patriots," extremists from Pamyat, could be their allies. In the second place, it is thought that the responsibility for this must lie either with the RSFSR Communist Party as a whole (this is "its line") or its leader ("personal initiative").

But clear and concrete answers were given to these trick questions. For example, M. Deych's curiosity was satisfied: 101 organizations participated in this conference of patriotic forces and Pamyat was not one of them.

The same kind of detailed answers were given to other questions as well.

In addition to I.K. Polozkov, the leadership of the Communist Party of Russia was represented at the press conference by: N.S. Stolyarov, RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and Central Audit Commission chairman; I.I. Antonovich, member of the Politburo and RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee secretary, and Central Committee members A.S. Demidova and O.Ye. Kirillov.

Western Republics

Union's Referendum Maneuvers in Moldova Cited

Poll Previews Vote

LD1403091291 Moscow TASS in English 0751 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Kishinev March 14 TASS—A total of 43.1 percent of those polled favour Moldova in a renovated Soviet Union, revealed a poll on Moldova's future conducted by the All-Union Public Opinion Centre and the Republican Sociological Association.

The study has shown that 41.8 percent of the poll said Moldova should be an independent sovereign state, while 3.1 percent believe Moldova should unite with Romania. Ten percent of those polled were undecided.

Publishing the results of the poll, the Moldovan independent trade union newspaper, VOCEA POPORUDUI, writes that a majority of the polled representatives of ethnic minorities—Gagauz, Bulgarians, Russians and Ukrainians—advocate Moldova's participation in a renovated Union, while only 29.9 percent of the ethnic Moldovans polled share the opinion.

Most people over 50 and those with higher and secondary education support the republic remaining in the Soviet Union.

Supporters of a renovated Union include 64.4 percent of the polled heads of enterprises, institutions and organisations, 62 percent of technical personnel and 60 percent of pensioners.

Only 25.3 percent of students and 27.2 percent of scholars and cultural workers favour retaining the Union. Most of them favoured Moldova as an independent sovereign state.

The Moldovan leadership is particularly worried with the activities by the military in the republic. An appeal by the presidium of the republican parliament, distributed by the MOLDOVA-PRES news agency, reads that the setting up of polling stations in military units, commissariats and enterprises subordinated to the centre, "contradicts decisions by the republican parliament".

The Soviet parliament has allowed local councils, work collectives and military units to organise polling stations in republics, whose leadership refused to hold a referendum.

"By instructions aimed to hold a referendum on Moldovan territory at any cost, the centre interferes in the republic's internal affairs and encroaches upon its sovereignty," the appeal reads.

Moldovan presidential spokesman Dumitru Tirea told correspondents that "trucks and armoured personnel carriers with some 360 servicemen armed with submachine-guns have appeared in 15 district centres" by Wednesday's [13 March] noon.

District military commissariats spokesmen told TASS that a scheduled military exercise of the Odessa military district explains troop movements in Moldova. The exercise was planned last year and has nothing to do with the forthcoming referendum.

Additional Troops Reported

LD1503104591

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian at 2131 GMT on 14 March, during its "Television News Service" program, carries a short report on the dispatch of additional troops to Moldova in connection with the 17 March referendum.

A studio announcer says: "The situation in Moldova could worsen dangerously in connection with the referendum on 17 March. The republic's legislature has come out against the referendum. According to reports, additional troops have been sent to 17 rayons in Moldova."

The video then cuts from the studio to a recorded report from Moldova by reporter M. Sokirke. Behind the reporter the video shows street scenes, tanks, and soldiers. The reporter says that the majority of the population supports the government position on the referendum, although some people in Pridnestrovye are in favor of the referendum. He says that when the tanks and armed soldiers moved in on 13 March, events took a new turn. It is said that the troops are there for manuevers and a call-up of reservists.

Returning to the studio, the annoucer says: "We had a telephone call today from General Plekhanov, a member of the military council of Odessa military okrug, who said that there are no manuevers in Moldova. He said the military equipment and troops are at their bases, and that planned training of reservists is in progress. The Army representative said the People's Front of Moldova is trying to wreck the referendum. The poll is being held in the military commissariats, where servicemen and their families, as well as citizens of Moldova who wish to take part in the referendum, will be voting. Several military commissariats have been blockaded by People's Front activists. The leaders of the local soviets are issuing a warning that voters will be deprived of land allotments."

'Dnestr Republic' Chairman's Status Defined

LD1403224991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1942 GMT 14 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Fedor Angeli]

[Text] Kishinev, 14 Mar (TASS)—The supreme soviet of the Dnestr republic, judged to be anti-constitutional by the Moldovan legislature, has adopted the law "On the Status of the Chairman of the Dnestr Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [DMSSR]."

In accordance with the adopted document, the DMSSR chairman exercises supreme executive and managerial power throughout the Dnestr republic, directly heads its government, and insures the interaction of the supreme organs of state power and administration. Any DMSSR citizen between 35 and 65 may be elected to the post. He is elected through universal, equal, and direct suffrage by secret ballot for a period of five years. The same person may not be DMSSR chairman for more than two terms. The post of chairman of the republic may not be combined with any other position.

Caucasus

Gorbachev Peace Appeal on Nagorno-Karabakh

PM1503115591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Mar 91 Second Edition p 1

[Appeal from USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev: "To the People of Azerbaijan and the Inhabitants of Nagorno-Karabakh"]

[Text] Dear comrades!

I appeal to you at a responsible and alarming time. Major transformations that are taking place in our country, including in the sphere of interethnic relations, are proceeding with difficulty. Unfortunately there has not been success in avoiding grave conflicts, which has meant human casualties.

For the fourth year now there is no peace on the soil of Nagorno-Karabakh, shots are thundering out, people are dying, and mutual alientation is growing.

What now? I understand that it is not a simple matter to stop the chain reaction of insults, anger, and mutual vengeance, but it needs to be stopped.

It is important here to proceed from realities. The Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast is an inalienable part of Azerbaijan, where the constitutions of the USSR and the Azerbaijan Republic function and where Armenians and Azerbaijanis live and work together. That is how history has ordained it. There is no way you can get away from that, and that means that it is necessary to return life to normal as fast as possible and to start by holding democratic elections and forming lawful bodies of power.

May your eyes not dwell on past and present insults and injustices. Forget reproaches. Start a peaceful dialogue. Try to understand each other, to find a way out of the impasse. You see it is clear that nobody can do this for you.

I hope very much that my words will find a response in your hearts. I wish you peace and happiness.

[Signed] USSR President M. Gorbachev

Prospects for Referendum in Armenia Viewed

PM1503145091 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Mar 91 First Edition p 1

[Colonel A. Kaushanskiy report under general heading "Referendum: Forecast of Results": "The Doors Remain Open"]

[Text] Yerevan—Armenia will conduct its own referendum. It is taking place some time hence—on 21 September. But the wording of the question has at this moment already been approved: "Do you agree to the Republic of Armenia being an independent democratic state not forming part of the USSR?"

But what about the 17 March Union referendum?

The local mass media are giving more thought to criticizing the actual question to be put at the referendum, than to trying to determine their position in principle. However, squabbles in newsprint or in words are not the main point. At the beginning of February, parliament published a statement: "The Republic of Armenia Supreme Soviet considers the 17 March 1991 referendum question on preserving the USSR to be inadequately prepared, and the holding of the referendum unacceptable."

True, the republic's Communist Party leadership have a somewhat different opinion on this score. This is the position of A. Sarkisyan, secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee: "As concerns the Union treaty, the Central Committee, while being committed to the republic's sovereignty, nevertheless does not consider a complete break with the Union expedient. That is, its position is as follows: Armenia should be part of a reformed federation based on a reformed Union treaty. And here emphasis should be put on the status of autonomous entities..."

More than once, I chanced to hear the same opinions from people representing various political tendencies. But I simply did not succeed in learning of the actual existence of even one commission for conducting the USSR referendum in Armenia.

I suppose only the military who are doing their service here, and their families too, have have made up their minds unreservedly to give their "blessing" to our common union. The situation is as a whole the same throughout the Transcaucasus Military District. Incidentally, a member of the district working group for the conduct of the USSR referendum, Colonel V. Knyazev,

told me about the many calls and requests from war and labor veterans, particularly from Armenia, to be given the opportunity to vote in the units.

And so, as they say, what do we have in prospect? A completely pessimistic forecast. But I would not wish to overdramatize the situation. The door to the Union remains open.

Azerbaijan's Aliyev Opposes Union Referendum

91US0346A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 12 Mar 91 p 1

[Article by Ali Naibov: "Common Sense Prevailed"]

[Text] Baku—On resuming its work after a break, the second round of the session of the Azerbaijan Republic Supreme Soviet lasted a total of three days—three days marked by the adoption of a truly fateful decision for the Azerbaijani people: to hold a referendum on 17 March.

At the session the deputies encountered the active attempts of parliamentarians, united in the "Democratic Bloc of Azerbaijanis," to torpedo the very idea of a referendum. They were joined by some representatives of the old party guard who, apparently, did not want to forego principles.

The parliamentarians were surprised, if not discouraged, by the speech of Geydar Aliyev, who called on them not to hold a referendum and who at the same time declared that the Communist Party has lost its authority completely and for this reason should abdicate its rule.

It appears that he stands shoulder to shoulder on this question with B. Yeltsin. The symbolic solidarity of two former high party officials! But this political change of tune of G. Aliyev apparently "resounded" so unexpectedly that it evoked a rebuke on the part of the Democratic Bloc members, in particular in the speech of R. Kaziyev.

The considered, reasonable, and at the same time emotional speech of A. Mutalibov, president of the Azerbaijan Republic, relieved the tense situation in the hall to some degree. It would seem that it put an end to the discussion, but... After the break, an ultimatum followed on the part of some deputies: If you decide to hold a referendum, we will begin a political hunger strike right here in the conference hall. Jumping ahead, I will say: I was in the Supreme Soviet today, but I did not notice anyone starving there.

Let us assume that no one has died yet from hunger strike, but there is a second threat on the part of members of the Democratic Bloc—to establish a "National Azerbaijan Soviet," in effect an alternative parliamentary political structure that is much more dangerous. We will say frankly: This vocabulary reminds us too much of other odious appeals of leaders of the Russian parliament which, it must be said, are viewed rather skeptically and cautiously in Azerbaijan. Then, why repeat them?

Azerbaijan: Gunfire Kills 3; 'War of Stones'

LD1403143691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1417 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Vadim Byrkin report]

[Text] Stepanakert, 14 Mar (TASS)—Unknown persons shot automatic weapons at a bus today on the border between Askeranskiy and Agdamskiy rayons in Azerbaijan. As a result, three people were killed and three seriously wounded. Law enforcement bodies are investigating.

This was preceded by another outbreak of the "war of stones." In settlements Khodzhaly, inhabited mainly by Azerbaijanis; and Askeran, with a population of Armenians, more than 17 motor vehicles were smashed by stones. Several injured people were taken to the oblast hospital.

The commandant's staff is taking steps to put a stop to further illegal actions, having stepped up the emergency situation regime in Askeranskiy rayon, and is implementing checks on the roads and carrying out searches for weapons.

Deputy MVD Minister Gromov Visits Ossetia

LD1403204291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1605 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, 14 Mar (TASS)—Tension is not subsiding in South Ossetia. This is what TASS correspondent Valeriy Shanayev was told today at the press center of the extraordinary committee attached to the office of chairman of the North Ossetian Supreme Soviet.

Armed clashes continue between the hostile sides in the villages of Znauri, Kareli, and Tskhinvali rayons. The villages of Tsnelisi, Gvirgvina, Onga, and Kaleti are being subjected to thuggery. Thugs beat up the local inhaibtants and extort money from them.

The 12,000 refugees who have arrived in Tskhinvali over the past few days have further exacerbated the food situation in the area, which is subject to a state of emergency. According to the North Ossetian Ministry of Health, there is a danger of a typhoid epidemic. Municipal services have not been working in the oblast center for several months now. People are drawing water from mountain rivers and wells.

Quoting the press center of the Georgain Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Sakinform news Agency says that bandits attacked the Georgian village of Gudzhabauri in Tskhinvali rayon, extremists burned three houses belonging to Georgians.

Boris Gromov, USSR first deputy minister of internal affairs, has arrived in the area subject to a state of emergency. At the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs press center the TASS correspondent was told that today he met the oblast leadership and discussed ways of stabilizing the situation in the region.

Caucasus Region Reportedly 'On Brink of War'

91US0346B Moscow TRUD in Russian
12 Mar 91 p 4

[Article by TASS correspondent V. Zenkovich for TRUD: "South Ossetia: How Criminal Acts Are Disguised"]

[Text] Vladikavkaz-Tskhinvali-Tbilisi—**"The road to life" is the name given in Tskhinvali to a narrow mountain path that connects the oblast center with the outside world. Only on it is it possible now to get out of the impoverished, blockaded city: All roads here are controlled by groups of armed Georgian "volunteers"—"fighters for a united and independent Georgia"—and cordons of militia who arrived from Tbilisi, whom the local residents treat with distrust. And not without reason. It is not uncommon that militants of various extremist political groups who rob and murder people hide behind militia uniforms.**

Women, children, and old people, bogged down in wet snow and risking falling from the mountain slope into an abyss, move through the pass in an endless stream. More than 12,000 of them came from South Ossetia to Vladikavkaz alone. People are also going to Tskhinvali. Some are returning home, bent over from the weight of sacks and bags with provisions, and others are hurrying to find out about relatives or friends.

Many in the oblast center of South Ossetia and in Tbilisi think that the roots of the inflamed Georgian-Ossetian conflict can be found in the policy of the present leadership of the republic, which is directed at Georgia's secession from the USSR.

At the same time Torez Kulumbegov, leader of the South Ossetian Soviet Democratic Republic, which was proclaimed on 20 September last year, explains the emergence of the conflict not only by the refusal of the leadership of Georgia to sign the new Union treaty but also by Z. Gamsakhurdia's policy "to establish a capitalist system in the republic," which, it is T. Kulumbegov's conviction, will not be accepted by a majority of the Ossetian population.

The chairman of the South Ossetian Soviet was accused of stirring up interethnic strife and increasing official powers, and was arrested. Attempts to meet with him in Tbilisi, where he is in custody, were unsuccessful. Meanwhile, rumors are making the rounds in Tskhinvali and other population centers of South Ossetia that allegedly T. Kulumbegov is being tortured in an investigation isolation cell. Passions are mounting....

However, the political discord is often used as a screen to cover commonplace criminal acts.

In response to the conduct of elections to the parliament of South Ossetia, the Supreme Soviet of Georgia declared the republic illegal, abolished the autonomous oblast, and introduced a state of emergency in Tskhinvali and Dzhavskiy Rayon.

The militia proved to be inadequate in controlling the situation. In addition, a significant part of it was made up of workers who previously had not encountered the practical employment of weapons. Attempts to suppress robbery were not crowned with success. Then, dressing in civilian clothing, part of the militia fled the city. Some of them even shot themselves in the hand or leg, so that this would free them of having to stay in Tskhinvali.

Convinced that the Georgian militia is not in a condition to stop excesses, the Ossetians and Georgians who live in the state of emergency area have themselves resorted to weapons. That is how the self-defense detachments emerged. Everyone acquired automatic weapons and pistols as best they could: They attacked the cordons of Georgian "patriots" and militia detachments. The production of weapons was started secretly in the shops of some enterprises and in underground workshops. Somewhere they even procured "NURS's"—unguided missiles that are designed for combating tanks. At the same time, to pour oil on the fire, "patriots" began to shoot up Georgian villages at night, accusing the Ossetians of this. And, on the other hand, after setting fire to the house of an Ossetian, they placed the blame on the Georgians. This also served as grounds for interethnic strife. Armed clashes started between residents of neighboring Georgian and Ossetian villages and street fights in Tskhinvali.

In the muddy waters of an artificially created conflict, the "patriots"—of one and the other side—are catching a big fish. "In the commotion," money kept in the Tskhinvali bank was stolen, many stores and warehouses were plundered, and a large amount of automobile equipment was hijacked. Now, bandit formations are engaged in hunting for numerous motor vehicle caravans with humanitarian aid for residents of South Ossetia. "Income" is calculated in the millions of rubles. I was able to visit the headquarters of one of the criminal bands that was situated in the school of a Georgian village. It was noon. After tiring themselves during the evening, the "patriots" slept right on the floor in classrooms. But in the yard, dozens of "men on duty," who were weighted down with knives and grenades, were diligently changing the numbered plates on trucks "confiscated from Ossetian extremists." "The equipment must serve the cause of the independence of a united Georgia and not the separatist-Ossetians," the leader commented on the actions of his subordinates...

The populated centers of the state of emergency area were inundated with "shady" characters of not only Georgian or Ossetian nationality who arrived from various regions of the country. During the day they roam

through the streets, but at night, uniting in criminal groups, they come out on the "main road."

The crimes committed by the "strollers," as a rule, are distinguished by their particular ferocity. Thus, five of them were arrested by law enforcement organs while mining a village street. All of them came to the state of emergency area from Rostov Oblast and North Ossetia. But guests with a criminal past from faraway Kemerovo, armed to the teeth, were arrested in an attempted rape of two young Georgian girls. Breaking into the homes of residents of South Ossetian villages, bandits frequently torture people, extorting money and valuables.

In Tskhinvali houses are not being heated. There is a breakdown in bread supplies. The water supply is disrupted. Medical establishments do not have bandages, medicines, and syringes. A 68-year-old woman with awful bruises and burns is lying in the city hospital. "Patriots" broke into her home at night and demanded money. She gave them 300 rubles—all of her savings. This seemed like too little to the slightly drunk "fighters for a united Georgia." They began to beat her. And when they got tired, they poured kerosene over the woman, set her on fire, and hid....

Despite the interethnic strife, doctors are helping the people, regardless of their national origin. Georgian and Ossetian militants who were shooting each other not long ago are recovering together with their seriously wounded victims in neighboring beds in the hospital's surgery department. But at the same time, their children are playing "kvacha" on city barricades stained with their parents' blood.

They do not have time now for education: The school classrooms are cold. But it generally gives one a sickening feeling to approach School No. 5: During the days of outrages a cemetery was formed outside the building. The "fighters for human rights" did not allow people to be buried in the city cemetery; therefore, teachers and students who died were buried right here. That is also the way they treated old people who were in cold and unheated rooms in the old-age home. One Tskhinvali artist was buried in his own workshop....

While Z. Gamsakhurdia is settling scores with political enemies, and the Union parliament is trying to persuade the bandits not to pillage and not to murder and trying to use "political methods" to put a stop to the partisan war in South Ossetia, people are continuing to perish there. The Caucasus stands on the brink of war.

Kalinin Name Changed by City Council

NC1503142691 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] The Kalinin city council held a session during which it reviewed the foreign name of the city and decided to rename the city Tashir, the name of one of the regions of Great Hayk and Gugark provinces [of ancient Armenia].

The decision has been sent to the Armenian Supreme Soviet for approval.

Central Asia

Asanbayev Defends Kazakh Referendum Wording

PM1503142791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Mar 91 Second Edition p 3

[Interview with Ye. Asanbayev, chairman of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic, by correspondent T. Yesilbayev; date not given, in Alma-Ata: "Let Us Preserve the Common Home"; followed by academics V. Kudryavtsev and B. Topornin "Authoritative Opinion"]

[Text] Alma-Ata—On nationwide referendum day the people of Kazakhstan will receive a ballot containing the following question: "Do you consider it necessary to preserve the USSR as a union of equal, sovereign states?" As we can see, it differs from the wording that was proposed by the USSR Supreme Soviet. Why is that? A PRAVDA correspondent asked Ye. Asanbayev, chairman of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet to comment.

"In our view, the wording proposed by the union parliament is somewhat unwieldy and woolly. It gave rise to many fair questions in the media and in citizens' letters. On the initiative of the deputies themselves, the republic Supreme Soviet changed the wording at its extraordinary session, making it simpler and clearer, that is, in our wording the referendum question contains just two essential points that concern every inhabitant of Kazakhstan today. They are the preservation of the USSR and the place of each republic, equal and sovereign, in it.

"The need for the renewal of the federation and for equal rights for people, whatever nationality they belong to, is stressed in a number of important official documents recently adopted by Kazakhstan's supreme organ of state power. For instance, on three occasions the republic's legislature has confirmed its dedication to a renewed federation, including its 11 February appeal to the Suporeme Soviets of the republics of the USSR, which says: 'We have no alternative but to go for a renewed Union on the basis of a Union Treaty among the sovereign, equal republics.' Moreover, article five of the Declaration on Kazakh SSR state security guarantees all citizens living on the republic's territory all the rights and freedoms envisaged by the USSR Constitution and Kazakh SSR Constitution, irrespective of national and party affiliation, origin, social and property status, gender and religion, type of occupation and place of residence.

"So the suspicions of some writers of letters from Tselinograd, Ust-Kamenogorsk, and other cities in the republic that the Kazakhstan leadership and parliament intend to infringe someone's rights in some way are unfounded. The referendum question wording adopted in the republic (incidentally, 259 of the 286 people's

deputies of the multinational legislature of Kazakhstan, or nearly 91 percent, voted for it) incorporates what was laid down in the draft Union Treaty, the most important, the most basic point: The centerpiece of the transformation of our country is a union of equal, sovereign republics, which will remain a unified state.

"But it cannot be otherwise. Our republics' economies are deeply integrated with one another and you cannot butcher this fully formed, living, and unified organism. All the republics have a common historical destiny and our peoples can only get out of the current difficult situation by keeping together. You do not have to look far for examples. Take the Aral problem. Or the fact that Kazakhstan imports from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Uzbekistan nearly 10 times as much food as it exports to these republics. And it receives from them a quantity of consumer goods, six times greater overall, than it supplies. But Kazkahstan gives the other republics a great deal too. In short, we need each other.

"Finally, one cannot discount purely human relationships, the friendship between people of different nationalities that has been established over the years and has stood the test of bloodshed and hunger, the joy of victories, and common grief. It would blasphemy to say today that all this has crumbled and sunk into oblivion.

"Renewed Union or no renewed Union? In view of the aforesaid and also of the fact that there will be a direct and unequivocal answer to the pivotal question of the referendum, I believe that the results of the vote in Kazakhstan on the wording specified by the republic's parliament will be an organic part of the results of the all-union referendum on the preservation of the USSR—our great common homeland."

Authoritative Opinion

The version of the question presented for the USSR referendum in Kazakhstan differs in form from the one that was adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet. But it does not essentially contradict it. The Kazakhstan wording lacks two components of the union version of the question: the mention of the Union as a renewed federation and of the rights and freedoms of citizens. However, these points are not repudiated by the formula presented for the referendum in the Kazakh SSR. The representatives of Kazakhstan supported the draft new Union Treaty, in which the USSR is described as a federative state that cares about the comprehensive development of every individual and the provision of a real guarantee of that individual's rights and freedoms. In view of these facts, the two aforementioned wordings can be considered compatible.

[Signed] V. Kudryavtsev, USSR People's deputy and vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and B. Topornin, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of State and Law.

Kazakhstan's Fedotova Views Referendum Prospects

LD1403173991 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Interview with Z.L. Fedotova, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic, by unidentified correspondent; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] Do you consider it necessary to preserve the USSR as a union of equal sovereign states? That is the question that the people of Kazakhstan will answer in the referendum.

[Fedotova] We thought that the question should contain two sides, if one can put it that way. First, we must answer: do you consider it necessary to preserve the USSR as a federative democratic state? Second, we stressed that it would be a new union, comprising equal, sovereign states. We confirm once again the sovereignty of our own Union republic. Therefore, the Presidium of the Republic's Supreme Soviet requested the USSR Supreme Soviet to regard the results of the referendum carried out on the territory of our republic with our wording as forming part of the result of the USSR referendum.

[Correspondent] In general, how is the situation in the republic regarding the referendum shaping up?

[Fedotova] Basically, the situation is amicable. We know that the mood of most of our republic's population favors voting for the Union, voting for a new Union. But there are difficulties. Specifically, in eastern Kazakhstan, in the town of ust-Kamenogorsk, where a session of the town soviet expressed disagreement with the wording of the republic's parliament. There is a problem in Uralsk, where people would also like the referendum to be held in accordance with two ballot papers—a ballot paper with the wording of the USSR Supreme Soviet and of our parliament. But, in a number of other oblasts, in principle, we think that everything has been prepared, so that the referendum will be conducted in an organized manner and that the main questions will be answered.

Kirghiz Official Previews 17 Mar Referendum

PM1403155991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 91 Second Edition p 1

[Correspondent Yu. Razgulyayev report under general heading "Everyone Decides the Fate of the Country": "We Shall Preserve Unity!"]

[Text] Bishkek—The Kyrgyzstan Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium adopted a decision 6 March to hold a citizens' poll together with the all-Union referendum. The citizens will have to answer the question: "Do you agree that the Kyrgyzstan Republic should form part of a reformed Union as an equal sovereign republic (state)?" Our correspondent asked Supreme Soviet Chairman M. Sherimkulov to comment on this decision.

"The suggestion to hold a referendum 17 March on the future of our multinational Union met with unanimous approval both from the people's deputies at the Supreme Soviet session and from the overwhelming majority of people living in Kyrgyzstan. Decades of our history, and particularly its recent troubled years, have shown that it is simply impossible to get out of a crisis on one's own, that isolation only multiplies any problems.

"There are more than enough examples of this. The disruption of economic links has had a painful effect both on city dwellers and on people who work in agriculture. It has become fashionable to condemn the administrative-command system for this, and the whole of our past as well. But, you know, the Union has also brought us a great deal of good and has significantly helped to speed up the republic's development.

"But is it really true that we find examples of real cooperation only in the past? This winter, for instance, when the bread baking situation in the republic became extremely acute, fraternal Kazakhstan came to our aid. Russia helped us out with gasoline. Indeed, any enterprise is connected by the strongest threads to various regions of the country.

"In a word, from any viewpoint—be it economic, political, or cultural—the Union is simply essential. But what sort of Union?

"The people of Kyrgyzstan ardently support equality of all peoples and agree to a reformed federation, but an attempt to freeze the old structures has brought forth protest from many people.

"Hotheads urged us to alter the wording of the Union referendum. No less resolute radicals started to incite citizens to wreck the referendum or vote 'no' in it. We think that both these options are equally dangerous and unconstructive.

"We have chosen the following path. On the day of the referendum every Kyrgyzstan inhabitant will receive ballots for both the referendum and a poll. It is in this latter document that the question about the equal sovereign republic will be included. I will explain at once that this poll has no juridical force. We regard it as an investigation, as a sounding of public opinion.

"I am sure that the majority of people living in Kyrgyzstan will answer the question in the Union referendum in the affirmative. Recently our president A. Akayev returned from a trip around the most troubled areas of Osh Oblast. He visited many cities and villages which suffered in the interethnic clashes in the summer, and then in the earthquake as well. And practically all the people there spoke about consolidation and the need to strengthen our Union.

"So what do we expect of our poll? Its result will give a real assessment of the sociopolitical situation in the republic and will help us to work out the correct strategy and tactics in subsequent work on the Union Treaty."

Kirghiz CP Chief Urges Referendum 'Yes' Vote

PM1403150391 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Mar 91 First Edition p 1

[Article by A. Masaliyev, first secretary of the Kyrgyzstan Communist Party Central Committee and a mining engineer: "I Believe in Genius of Russian People"]

[Text] Bishkek—Our great power is living through difficult days. Millions of people of various nationalities today are worried by the question: Will the country retain its unity? The negative processes taking place in the USSR's sociopolitical and economic life and also in Russia deeply perturb me and my compatriots.

As a citizen of the Soviet Union with many friends and acquaintances in the Russian Federation, as a graduate of the Moscow mining institute, I decided through SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA to appeal to the Russians, Tatars, Bashkirs, Yakuts, Udmurts, and Mari—all peoples of Russia, the country's biggest republic—to vote on referendum day for a unified Union, for the friendship and fraternity of our peoples.

I support the efforts of the Communists, party organizations, and all progressive forces of Russia to stabilize the situation and to enhance the prestige of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] as the backbone of the USSR.

In appealing to you I sincerely believe in the genius of the Russian people. Frequently in the history of the fatherland they have assumed the main burden. So it was during industrialization and the Great Patriotic War. I am sure that so it will be this time too. Our republic, which numbers 4.4 million people, a quarter of which consists of the Russian-speaking population, is also doing everything to preserve the USSR.

I appeal to all Russians and particularly to the working class and as a miner in the past to all miners to display wisdom and maturity and on 17 March to give their votes for the conservation of the USSR as a renewed federation, whose main concern will be the welfare of all Soviet peoples.

Dear Russian brothers, we must all heed the voice of reason, renounce emotion, and ensure peace and calm on our Soviet land, which is our common home. The whole world and the peoples of the planet, especially of the underdeveloped countries, are looking at us and hoping that that our multiethnic country will again acquire its former importance. So let's remember the behests of the great Lenin and the efforts of the Bolsheviks and veterans with regard to the need to strengthen the USSR.

Makhkamov Advocates Union Treaty

91US0355A Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA in Russian 21 Feb 91 p 1

[Statement by K.M. Makhkamov, President of the Tajik SSR]

[Text] Respected comrades!

I consider it my duty to make a statement to you about the upcoming referendum, which is supposed to answer the question of whether our renewed Union will exist or not.

The urgent need to conclude a new Union treaty is dictated by life itself. For each unbiased, thinking person who is aware of the past and the present of the Tajik people, it is quite clear that our people obtained freedom and revitalized our state only in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [SSR].

Tremendous changes transforming our region have occurred. Undoubtedly they could have been even more impressive if, during a well-known period, crude distortions of the fundamental principles of construction of the nation and state and disregard of the rights of some nations and peoples had not been tolerated.

The restructuring that has begun in the country has opened the way to elimination of these deformations and to full restoration of the sovereignty of all peoples, including our own.

The Declaration on the State Sovereignty of the Tajik SSR adopted by the republic's Supreme Soviet firmly orients us toward strengthening the independence of the republic and constructing a democratic rule-of-law state belonging to a renewed federation. We consider the immediate signing of a new Union treaty to be extremely important for this.

The main reason for supporting the new Union treaty is that we are convinced it answers the basic interests of all the republics and peoples and that only this act gives us a real opportunity for ending the crisis and ensures social protections for the population under the harsh conditions of a market economy.

It is inexcusable to forget that we are at an extreme, beyond which may ensue the complete collapse of the great Soviet state and the bankruptcy of the economy with unforeseeable, catastrophic consequences for the overwhelming majority of the country's population.

Speaking in favor of a renewed Union and addressing myself to your reason and common sense, I say once more that there is no time to waste.

One cannot help but see that any attempts undertaken now to drown the issues covered by the all-Union referendum in discussions, such as yesterday's speech by the chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, are being carried out in pursuit of antipeople goals.

In conjunction with this critical situation, I consider it necessary to adopt an appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Tajikistan TV Studio Begins Broadcasting

LD0303232291 Moscow Central Television Second Program and Dubi Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 3 Mar 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Summary] A new television studio has started operations in Tajikistan's Khudzhand Oblast. Its broadcasts will be received by residents of the oblast and nearby villages and rayon centers in Uzbekistan and Kirghizia. The new studio now broadcasts for only one hour a day in Tajik, mainly news and advertisements, but an increase in the volume of broadcasts and the preparation of artistic and musical programs in Russian, Tajik, Uzbek, and Kirghiz is planned.

Turkmen Legislation on 1991 Budget

914A0479A

For this legislation published in the 31 January 1991 TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-012, pages 35-37.

Uzbek President on Nationality Conflicts

AU0803103991 Berlin BERLINER ZEITUNG in German 5 Mar 91 p 3

[Interview with Islam Karimov, president of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic, by Roland Heine, Moscow correspondent of BERLINER ZEITUNG; place and date not given: "In Uzbekistan an Islamic State Will Not Be Possible"]

[Text] [Heine] Mr. President, it is not only representatives of the Islamic clergy who predict that the proportion of active believers among the original population of Uzbekistan will rise to 90 percent and more over the next five to 10 years. Will an Islamic Republic of Uzbekistan be established soon?

[Karimov] It is correct that the influence of Islam is strongly increasing, but I do not believe that an Islamic state will be possible in Uzbekistan. The objective social conditions do not exist for that, and there is no trend toward self-isolation, either. On the contrary, we are conducting a policy of opening up toward the world. And we will not give up seeing Islamic belief and religious fanaticism as two different things.

[Heine] In contrast to the leading representatives of the Baltic republics or Georgia, you are clearly coming out in favor of a renewed Union of sovereign republics with equal rights. Are the responsible people in Vilnius or Tbilisi wrong?

[Karimov] The people in each republic have to decide matters for themselves, in particular since the regional differences are very big. The Baltic states, for instance, have their own history and their own understanding of

values. One has to take into consideration both the general political situation and the economic and social conditions. I can understand the attitude of Georgia, the Baltic republics, or Moldova, because there they proceed on the basis of their specific situation.

After sober analysis of the situation in Uzbekistan, however, we have come to the view that our republic's best prospects lie in a renewed federation. I would like to give you just two figures: The per-capita national income in Uzbekistan is not only three times lower than in the Baltic states, but it is also only half of the Union average. The republic has a completely underdeveloped, one-sided economy. We are mainly deliverers of raw material, and even the existing processing industry provides mostly only intermediate products. A total of 92 percent of all Uzbek cotton fibers are not processed in our country. On the other hand, we have to import more than half of the goods needed by the population.

Or let us take the water supply. Practically all water resources, with which one could expand the irrigated areas, have been exhausted. The Amu-Darya and the Syr-Darya rivers are exploited by five republics; the state of Lake Aral is a disaster; none of the republics can act alone on this question. You can also look at the dependence regarding the energy supply or the problem of employment. Can a republic with such basic conditions adopt any other policy than what we are doing with our advocacy of the federation?

[Heine] Do you completely rule out the possibility that the Union referendum on 17 March will result in a "no" to a federation from the majority of Uzbekistan's population?

[Karimov] Everything will depend on the position adopted by the deputies on site. The situation is complicated because the formulation of the question asked at the referendum was imposed on the republics by the center. An attempt is being made to force Moscow's view of the character of the new Union on us.

[Heine] You mean the implication of socialism and Soviet order in the question?

[Karimov] Yes. The question is whether the preservation of a "Union of Socialist Soviet Republics" is necessary as a renewed federation of sovereign republics with equal rights. These are actually three questions. And Kirgizia, Georgia, and Azerbaijan have long eliminated the word "socialist" from their names. In other words: The question of the referendum is aimed at revising the decisions of various republican parliaments. The people are forced into a situation where they either have to vote against the republican legislatures elected by them or against the Union.

[Heine] Does the Union treaty have any chance at all against this background?

[Karimov] There is indeed the question of whether the center actually still wants a renewed federation. At the moment, Moscow is making an enormous effort to present the republics as the ones mainly to be blamed for the current situation.

[Heine] Fergana, May 1989; the area of Tashkent, March 1990; two months later, Andizhan; in December, Namangan—the intervals between the clashes between nationalities in Uzbekistan are becoming shorter.

[Karimov] In my view, these events must not all be lumped together. One would not only be far from the facts in this case, but one would also play into the hands of those in the center who want to discredit our striving for sovereignty and are looking for excuses to bar our path.

As regards Fergana, the disastrous social, ecological, and economic situation in this region had been completely played down for a long time. Objectively seen, the explosion was only a question of time. Also, one must not forget that Fergana is, first and foremost, a product of the all-Soviet economic policy.

In addition, there were serious violations of the law and ethics and serious crimes against the people's rights in Uzbekistan. In some regions, people did not get any wages for up to 10 months—this was sheer slavery. Many among the population lost all hope. However, deprivation of rights was a nationwide problem. In our republic it was shown in a particularly marked way because the socioeconomic situation was particularly bad.

The background of the events of Fergana also includes the decades of national suppression of the Central Asian peoples. Imagine: Until recently it was impossible for a senior official to attend the burial of his own parents in a Muslim cemetery. These people had themselves hospitalized or quickly went on a business trip; an appearance at the cemetery usually resulted in being expelled form the party and dismissed.

And, finally: When the process was begun of putting the evils of the past in order, Moscow wanted to make an example of Uzbekistan. Hundreds of judges from the north came to "clear up." Those who shouted most loudly could be sure of their career. All over the country senior officials for Uzbekistan were recruited, and they started to "lead" mostly without any knowledge of the language or traditions. In May 1989 the long-overdue explosion was then directed against the "foreign" Meshkhetian Turks, who had been deported to this region decades ago.

[Heine] And what about Andizhan and Namangan?

[Karimov] These were no clashes between nationalities. There, it was mostly the high unemployment rate among the young people that played a role. We lost control over the proceedings, the vacuum was exploited by criminals.

[Heine] Where do you see a way out?

[Karimov] We are trying to do as much as possible in particular for the underprivileged. A total of 45 percent

of Uzbekistan's population live below subsistence level. Since the summer of 1989 we have distributed 185,000 hectares of land among the people; by the end of 1991, 500,000 hectares are supposed to be in private hands. In this way we hope to solve the food problem and to reduce unemployment. And in our country a person who owns land is also most likely to build a house on it.

We give apartments for free to the old people, whose influence is traditionally very high in Central Asia; grants were raised for most students. And all pupils of grades one to five now get a breakfast for free at school.

It is no less important that the relationship between state and religion has been fundamentally changed. Confrontation has been replaced by cooperation.

Uzbek, Kirghiz Leaders View Referendum

LD1403173691 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Network in Russian 1530 GMT 14 Mar 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A treaty of friendship and cooperation between the Republic of Kirghizia and the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic was signed today in the city of Osh.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent V. Fedorov] This action is unusual in many respects. Last year's interethnic conflict in Osh oblast could not but affect relations between the neighbors. But this meeting—and the delegations are headed by the presidents of the republics—and the letter and the spirit of the treaty show firm intention of removing the shadow of the tragedy and of returning to the friendly relations which are natural to both peoples and of raising cooperation to a qualitatively new and really businesslike level.

At the same time the questions were discussed in the context of the overall fate of the Union and the forthcoming all-union referendum.

[video shows interviews with A. A. Akayev, president of the Republic of Kirghizia, and I. A. Karimov, president of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic—captioned]

[Akayev] Among us, among the people, and in the Supreme Soviet of the republic the opinion is unambiguous: We should be in the Union. The referendum is being held in a few days time, on 17 March, will give a reply to two questions at once. In our republic, the Supreme Soviet of our republic adopted the decision to hold an additional poll on whether the Republic of Kirghizia should be in the Union, in the renewed Union, as an equal, sovereign state.

[Fedorov] What is your forecast?

[Karimov] I have said this before, and I would like to say now that there was no particular need for a referendum as such, and particularly in the conditions of Uzbekistan. We have just created a problem where there was none before, and today, there are various motives and attempts to gain what I would call cheap political capital from this. But the opinion of the majority of the population, the absolute majority, is unambiguous: Only within a single Union of equal, sovereign, autonomous states and republics is it possible to insure and to achieve the aim which we set ourselves. And we have just one aim: to provide a worthy life for the people.

[Akayev] I would like to add that the treaty which we are signing between our republics also works for the most rapid creation of the renewed Union which we are talking abut. This meeting of ours is taking place on the eve of the good and ancient eastern festival Nawruz which by tradition always brings calm, peace and prosperity to the peoples. [end recording]